

PORTSMOUTH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT  
PUBLIC MEETING ON THE  
PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE PROCESS BUILDINGS  
AND OTHER COMPLEX FACILITIES  
DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING  
EVALUATION PROJECT

AND

THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE  
SITE-WIDE WASTE DISPOSITION  
EVALUATION PROJECT

- - -

WAVERLY HIGH SCHOOL  
STATE ROUTE 220  
WAVERLY, OHIO  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2014  
6:00 P.M.

- - -

DIANA L. HODGE, CR  
RENO & ASSOCIATES  
POST OFFICE BOX 594  
WAVERLY, OHIO 45690

1 MONDAY EVENING SESSION

2 November 17, 2014

3 - - -

4 MR. WAGNER: Good evening and welcome to  
5 the PORTS D&D project. I want to thank everyone for  
6 coming out on a cold November night to talk about  
7 the two proposed plans for the site.

8 The plans are the proposed plans for the  
9 process buildings and the complex facilities,  
10 decontamination and decommissioning evaluation  
11 project. For the sake of tonight's meeting, we'll  
12 just call it the process buildings proposed plan, if  
13 you don't mind.

14 Also, we're going to talk about the  
15 proposed plan for the site-wide waste disposition  
16 evaluation project. Again, for purposes of the  
17 meeting tonight, we'll just refer to it as the waste  
18 disposition proposed plan.

19 Again, the proposed plans are very  
20 important for the site and it's part of the  
21 regulatory process as we work our way from the  
22 remedial investigation and feasibility studies,  
23 through the proposed plans and ultimately to the  
24 Records of Decision. So, again, I'd like to thank  
25 neighbors and the members of the public for coming

1 out.

2 There are a couple people that I want to  
3 call out that are here representing our community.  
4 If you would, when I call your name, please stand.  
5 From Senator Portman's office, we've got staffers  
6 Kevin Hoggatt and Todd Shelton. Thank you for  
7 joining us tonight.

8 From our congressional offices, from  
9 Congressman Wenstrup's office, we have Kaci Compton.  
10 Kaci, thank you for joining us tonight. And from  
11 Congressman Johnson's office, we have Juli Stevens.  
12 Ms. Stevens, thank you for joining us.

13 From the State of Ohio, we have a number  
14 of reps, including representatives from Ohio EPA.  
15 We welcome you tonight. Thank you.

16 As far as our county commissioners that  
17 are very involved in the project, from Pike County,  
18 we have Commissioner Teddy West. Commissioner,  
19 thank you. And Blaine Beekman. Commissioner  
20 Beekman, thank you.

21 Also, a group that's obviously very  
22 involved in the site is the Site-Specific Advisory  
23 Board. Here tonight with us, we have Will  
24 Henderson. Will is the Chairman of that Board, as  
25 well as Val Francis, who is the Vice-Chair. We have

1 got a number of members of the SSAB, so if you  
2 would, please stand, both present and past. Thanks  
3 again for being with us tonight.

4 Finally, we have got members of the  
5 Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative, or SODI.  
6 We have got Steve Shepherd, as well as Kevin  
7 Shoemaker. And I know we've got representatives  
8 from all four counties that are part of the SODI  
9 Board. Again, we recognize you and thank you for  
10 coming out tonight.

11 So here's the agenda. We'll go ahead and  
12 move to the second slide. Once we get through the  
13 welcomes, we'll have presentations by Joel Bradburne  
14 with the Department of Energy and Marc Jewett with  
15 Fluor-B&W. They will give an overview of the  
16 process and also talk specifically about the  
17 proposed plans.

18 Then from Ohio EPA, we'll have a  
19 presentation by Maria Galanti as well as Michael  
20 Rubadue with the Ohio Department of Health.

21 Then at that point, we'll transition --  
22 that will be done on the record. Then we'll  
23 transition into an informal Q&A session. This will  
24 be your chance -- if you have gone through the  
25 proposed plans and you have questions, this will be

1 a chance, in an informal setting, to ask questions  
2 and get answers. We'll have a panel up here to  
3 answer your questions. Again, that part will not be  
4 on the record.

5 My colleague, Eric Roberts, will lead that  
6 session. You can raise your hand, we'll get a  
7 microphone to you and you can pose your question to  
8 the panel. Again, that panel will include Joel  
9 Bradburne, Marc Jewett, the DOE Site Director,  
10 Doctor Vince Adams and Dennis Carr, who is the  
11 Fluor-B&W Site Director.

12 At that point, we'll take a quick break  
13 and then we'll enter into the formal public comment  
14 part of tonight's meeting. We're going to break  
15 that up in to two parts. The first part, we're  
16 going to talk about the waste disposition proposed  
17 plan. Again, we'll open that up, and Eric will lead  
18 that part of it.

19 Then we'll move into the facility D&D  
20 proposed plan. We'll open one and close it, then  
21 we'll open the next and close that. Again, that  
22 part of the meeting is going to be on the record.  
23 We have got our court reporter here that will  
24 document everything, so we ask you to speak clearly  
25 and please give your name and affiliation. We do

1 ask, for the sake of time, try to keep your comments  
2 to three to four minutes. If they are longer,  
3 please just offer a summary and then turn your  
4 comments right over to the court reporter. We just  
5 want to give -- make sure everyone has a chance to  
6 speak tonight.

7 We also -- in the far corner of the room,  
8 we have a second court reporter. So if you don't  
9 want to give your comments in front of an audience  
10 like this, you can go back there. Again, within  
11 three to four minutes, we ask you to summarize your  
12 comments. Then if it's longer than that, if you  
13 would, hand your statement to the court reporter.

14 Again, Eric will recognize any elected  
15 officials that are here first, and give them the  
16 opportunity to speak, then anyone else who has  
17 turned in their card -- we have got cards here. If  
18 you would, fill them out and state your name and  
19 your affiliation and what plan you would like to  
20 comment on. We'll put a mic stand up front here,  
21 Eric will call out each speaker, along with the  
22 speaker who is going to follow them, so that way we  
23 can keep things moving. Again, if you don't want to  
24 make your comment here, you can do it in the back of  
25 the room.

1           We also have copies of the proposed plans.  
2           They are still back there. Again, the public  
3           comment period itself is open until January 10th.  
4           So you still have plenty of time, it's a 60-day  
5           public comment period, to put your comments on the  
6           record. You don't have to do it here. There is  
7           plenty of time.

8           Again, all comments made on the record  
9           will be collected as part of the responsiveness  
10          summary. In that, we'll receive responses to every  
11          comment, and that will be part of the Record Of  
12          Decision which will be issued sometime in late  
13          spring or early summer. Again, when you leave your  
14          comments tonight during the formal comment section,  
15          you will not receive a response. We will just take  
16          your comment and then it will be responded to  
17          sometime after the 60-day comment period.

18          Again, we'll open up the waste disposition  
19          public comments part of the meeting, we'll close  
20          that and then we'll go on to facilities D&D.

21          One final comment here. This is a  
22          beautiful facility. We have got the exits on either  
23          side of you here. Restrooms are in the back. If  
24          there's any kind of a medical emergency, we've got  
25          Ashley Nichols. Ashley is in the back. If you want

1 to speak and you fill out a card, you can give your  
2 card to her. She's an EMT.

3 And I do ask everyone, if you have a pager  
4 or cell phone, put it on vibrate.

5 With that, I'll turn it over to Joel  
6 Bradburne with the Department of Energy.

7 MR. BRADBURNE: Well, good evening,  
8 everybody. Jeff, I would also like to recognize a  
9 member of Sherrod Brown's staff, Jeanne Wilson, who  
10 just, I noticed, walked in. There she is.

11 Again, I would like to welcome everybody  
12 on this nice fall evening. For those of you that  
13 haven't broken out your winter coat, I think it's  
14 time to do so.

15 Again, my name is Joel Bradburne. I'm  
16 with the Department of Energy, Office of  
17 Environmental Management. For those of you that  
18 aren't familiar, the Office of Environmental  
19 Management was established in 1989. It's sole  
20 mission in life is to remediate the legacy of the  
21 weapons program that DOE managed for many years. At  
22 this site, with the gaseous diffusion plant shut  
23 down -- just a little bit of history for those of  
24 you that don't know, and probably boring for those  
25 of you that were deeply involved in it.



1           The plant started up in about 1954,  
2           operated as part of the government until 1993, when  
3           it was privatized in an operation started by USEC.  
4           In 2000, USEC announced its intention to cease  
5           enriching uranium at Portsmouth, and through a  
6           series of events, that led to a plant return, back  
7           to the Department. It started in 2010 and ended in  
8           2011.

9           Throughout this time, we also had some  
10          regulatory arrangements in place with Ohio EPA, and  
11          also U.S. EPA. So in 1989, again, we entered into  
12          an agreement with Ohio EPA called a consent decree,  
13          and the U.S. EPA as well. That addressed the ground  
14          water contamination at the site and it also  
15          addressed the legacy landfills at the site.

16          We fast forward to 2010, and that's when  
17          we entered in to another agreement with Ohio EPA as  
18          part of the Director's Final Findings and Order, and  
19          that's where we addressed what I'll call the manmade  
20          structures at the site, what we do with the  
21          structures, the buildings and also what we do with  
22          the waste as a result of that.

23          So, you know, the site is -- you know, the  
24          remedy of the site, we're looking at -- we spent a  
25          lot of time working with the community, working with

1 the regulators and working with the elected  
2 officials. It's something that we look at as a  
3 holistic approach. And so tonight, although they  
4 are very important, they are a piece of this -- the  
5 complete site remedy.

6 The proposed plans are for the waste  
7 disposition and for the process buildings and  
8 complex facilities demolition. And the waste  
9 demolition is where the waste goes. Excuse me,  
10 waste disposition is where the waste goes.

11 I'll say it has been a -- I don't know,  
12 it's kind of like winter and fall again. This is  
13 the culmination of a lot of dialogue. I'll say that  
14 you should feel very proud of all of your elected  
15 officials, both union and otherwise. The SODI Board  
16 membership, the Ohio EPA as the regulator, they take  
17 their job of protecting the waters in the State  
18 very, very seriously.

19 The Department -- our mission is really a  
20 comprehensive and cost-effective cleanup of the  
21 site. The remedy that we look at has got to be  
22 balanced also. It's got to be practical, it's got  
23 to be implementable and it's got to be, above all,  
24 protective from a community standpoint, get it loud  
25 and clear, you guys are looking at something that

1 you could reindustrialize as this D&D progresses  
2 over time, not just to wait until the end of it.

3 As a part of all this dialogue, we believe  
4 that we have reached something that we feel  
5 represents a common ground. For us, as part of the  
6 building demolition option -- and Marc Jewett is  
7 going to talk about this in greater detail for you.  
8 It's really not complicated. Do these '50s vintage  
9 buildings stay up, or do they need to come down? I  
10 don't think it's a tough decision to see that, you  
11 know, that these were purpose-built for uranium  
12 enrichment in the gaseous diffusion process, and  
13 that's just not a viable technology anymore. So,  
14 therefore, we have selected, as our alternative, to  
15 demolish the buildings.

16 For the waste disposition, where the waste  
17 goes, again, that's a very complex decision, and  
18 it's taken a lot of time to get to the point that  
19 we're at. Jeff mentioned SSAB membership. Just a  
20 little bit about SSAB, we formed a Site-Specific  
21 Advisory Board in 2008. The SSAB is a facility  
22 advisory committee, so it's established under the  
23 Facility Advisory Committee Act, so there are  
24 regulations that go with how we conduct our  
25 relationship with the community, as just a little

1 bit of information on that.

2 Our goal is to select members of the  
3 community that represent the diversity of the  
4 community, and also make a selection based on  
5 contributions that they can provide. I'll say it's  
6 one of -- excuse me. They represent something like,  
7 you know, 60,000 members across the government.  
8 There are about 21 citizen advisory boards in the  
9 EM.

10 Just a little bit of a note, I understand  
11 that George Washington first consulted the community  
12 as part of the Whiskey Rebellion in 1784, or  
13 something like that. So it's not that you have to  
14 understand whiskey to be part of a citizen's  
15 advisory board, but I think if you were part of some  
16 of the discussions, you'll probably recognize that  
17 it might help.

18 So anyway, lots and lots of dialogue. I  
19 just want to convey to everybody here that there's  
20 been a lot of active dialogue. These people are not  
21 paid. They contribute their time. They represent  
22 the best of your community. These people make me  
23 feel obligated and feel good about coming to work,  
24 because they -- we spend a lot of nights, you know,  
25 in about the same kind of conditions that you've got

1 outside right now.

2 And at the end of the day, I think we  
3 understand that nobody wants an on-site disposal  
4 cell for on-site disposal cell purposes. You'll see  
5 as part of the proposed plan, with on-site disposal,  
6 again, as part of this common ground dialogue and  
7 resolution for the Department, we believe it does  
8 offer a very comprehensive solution for the site.  
9 We believe that -- we evaluate it and it was  
10 independently looked at and approved by our  
11 headquarters staff and the Corps of Engineers. It's  
12 a cost-effective alternative when you consider the  
13 long-term care and maintenance of this site.

14 I'll back up just a little bit more. So  
15 our job, at the end, is to do the remediation.  
16 We'll transition the site to another portion of DOE  
17 called Legacy Management, who will then take it and  
18 do extended care for -- as far as I can foresee in  
19 the future.

20 So for our evaluation, community interest,  
21 release as much of the site as practical. That also  
22 is our mission as well. We want to relieve our  
23 taxpayer dollars as much in the long term as  
24 reasonably practical. When it comes to risk  
25 reduction, you know, again, over an extended period

1 of time, hundreds of years, if you might imagine  
2 that, this comprehensive alternative, we believe,  
3 does that for us. It does take into account that we  
4 are going in and actively identifying these areas  
5 for fill that are bound under other agreements, and  
6 recognizing those.

7 We believe that it's very safe, it's  
8 technically feasible, it's protective. It is the  
9 best alternative for the taxpayer as well as the  
10 local community here. It provides a site that goes  
11 to reindustrialization, as well as preserving some  
12 of the esthetic aspects of the site. It goes to  
13 reducing the federal involvement at the site and  
14 taxpayer liability. Just excited to get on with it,  
15 I guess.

16 So I'll turn it over, then, to Marc.

17 MR. JEWETT: Thank you, Joel. I, too,  
18 appreciate all of you coming out tonight, on a night  
19 like tonight. It's great to see this type of  
20 participation and hearing about what's going to  
21 happen at the plant.

22 My name is Marc Jewett. I head up the  
23 Regulatory Planning Group for the Fluor team.  
24 Tonight, I want to kind of walk you through the  
25 highlights of how we got to where we are with this

1 set of decisions. Rest assured, everything that we  
2 talk about tonight is in those proposed plans in  
3 much greater detail. We would like to make sure  
4 that you look through all those before making your  
5 comments. If you are ready to make them tonight,  
6 that's fine, too. These things do provide a lot of  
7 information, and we're going to hit the high points  
8 here tonight. All of our slides that we use tonight  
9 will be available as a handout at the end of the  
10 session tonight.

11 I think Joel did a nice introduction to  
12 how we got to where we are decision-makingwise. As  
13 he indicated, we are under two regulatory agreements  
14 with the Ohio EPA. One is the consent decree that  
15 he mentioned. That, quite frankly, is this document  
16 right here. It's been around since the late 1980s  
17 and deals with soil and groundwater, and closure of  
18 the Legacy landfills at the site some 20 years ago.

19 And then the new document in 2010, the  
20 DFF&O, that's this binder right here, that set in  
21 motion the decisions that we're talking about  
22 tonight.

23 If you look here, there's really five  
24 decisions spawned by these two legal agreements that  
25 bring the total blueprint home for how Portsmouth is

1 going to be cleaned up. One of those has already  
2 been made. That's shown at the top there with a  
3 checkmark. That was a decision back in 2012 to take  
4 down 46 buildings, quite frankly, to jumpstart this  
5 project and get on with it, keep the work force  
6 actively engaged out there and begin the demolition  
7 of some of the easier and less-contaminated  
8 buildings, with the requisite that all the waste  
9 from that decision would have to leave the site  
10 until such time that these two decisions, that we're  
11 talking about tonight, were made.

12 So that got us off and running about two  
13 years ago. In yellow are the two decisions that  
14 these proposed plans speak to; basically the  
15 demolition decision and where does the waste go. We  
16 expect to make those as final decisions after public  
17 input later this spring.

18 The last two on this table basically show  
19 what's going to happen after this. We still have to  
20 set a final soil clean-up level. That will be done  
21 under the consent decree that Joel mentioned. That  
22 will be probably next year. That will tell us how  
23 clean is clean beneath the buildings, so that when  
24 this plant gets turned over for its next purpose in  
25 life, be it the reindustrialization or whatever the



1 community likes in the future, that will establish  
2 those final soil cleanup levels, to certify that the  
3 footprint is clean beneath the buildings and the  
4 adjacent lands.

5 Lastly, the groundwater decisions, there's  
6 been a number of them underway already for 20, 30  
7 years here at the plant. We do have to figure out  
8 what the final decision is for groundwater, and  
9 we'll get in to that tonight, because that dovetails  
10 in to some of the ways we're going to make the waste  
11 disposal decision here with these documents.

12 I did want to point out that while these  
13 legal agreements sets this all in motion, the  
14 proposed plans that you see and are able to read  
15 tonight and throughout the 60-day period are very  
16 thin, just a nice little summary at the public  
17 level, but they do make a preferred remedy pick on  
18 behalf of the government that you will see in here.

19 All that is underpinned by these documents  
20 here, which is the RI/FS. That stands for Remedial  
21 Investigation/Feasibility Study. That's all the  
22 technical, the engineering, the risk assessment,  
23 hydrogeology, you name it, the regulatory analysis  
24 that went on for the last couple of years between  
25 the Department of Energy and the Ohio EPA, to figure

1 out what is the right approach for this and how do  
2 we make sure it's safe and a sound, economic  
3 decision. So that's the underpinning to the  
4 proposed plans that you have here today.

5 Then the last part of the sequence will be  
6 a document, later in the spring, called a Record of  
7 Decision. It's another binder, another legal  
8 agreement. This is one from another site. So this  
9 is what we're striving for next spring, after public  
10 input.

11 What a Record of Decision does is three  
12 things. It makes the remedy selection basically a  
13 new legal compliance agreement between the  
14 Department and the Ohio EPA that has to be  
15 implemented from the terms that are written in that.  
16 It also deals with a responsiveness summary from the  
17 public comments that we get from sessions such as  
18 this, and any other feedback over the 60 days. Then  
19 lastly, it sets in motion all of the legal --  
20 basically the regulatory requirements that are set  
21 in motion and the term of art called ARARs. You've  
22 probably heard that term. It stands for Applicable  
23 or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. It's  
24 basically all the environmental laws, regulations  
25 and requirements that this sets in motion. There

1 may be upwards of 200 to 300 of those in a typical  
2 decision such as this. So that makes all that  
3 binding, as to how these remedies get implemented.

4 So in a nutshell, these are the documents  
5 that led to your proposed plan today, and two of the  
6 five decisions are really where we're headed with  
7 this decision.

8 Let me step through from there. What I  
9 would like to do is set the background on the site,  
10 what we have out there today, so you can see how all  
11 these decisions work together. That's an air photo  
12 of our plant. There are two areas at the plant that  
13 are not part of this decision. I just want to make  
14 sure that you're aware of that. They are shaded  
15 here in the two colors. One is the buildings out  
16 there that belong to the American Centrifuge Plant,  
17 the USEC facilities that are still out there, and  
18 then the Department's DUF6 Conversion Project that  
19 will go on for the indefinite future here, until  
20 that project is completed. Both of those are  
21 outside the D&D decision. So just think of those as  
22 areas that are ringed off within the set of  
23 buildings out there that are not part of this D&D  
24 decision.

25 So here's a few of the environmental

1 conditions out there today, prior to making any  
2 decisions. Perimeter Road, you see there in gold,  
3 is a landmark that circumscribes the production area  
4 at the plant there. Inside that body is about 1,000  
5 acres of land. This photo right here is the same  
6 one you see over here behind the court reporter.

7 In purple, there are the five groundwater  
8 plumes at the site that are contaminated with  
9 trichloroethylene, also known as TCE, a degreasing  
10 solvent used during the plant's heyday, back in the  
11 '50s and '60s. That's where we have groundwater  
12 contamination from past practices.

13 In yellow, are those Legacy landfills we  
14 spoke of that were closed some 15 to 20 years ago,  
15 most of them. A few were even before that. Those  
16 are all in yellow. You will see there's a variety  
17 of those former landfills inside Perimeter Road.  
18 Some of them are co-located with the plumes. As you  
19 can imagine, those are intimately linked; the  
20 groundwater contamination is a direct result of  
21 those landfills in the old days.

22 So that gives you kind of a view of the  
23 buildings, the plumes, the existing landfills and  
24 Perimeter Road. And then that red boundary is the  
25 3,700 acres of the whole plant reservation. So

1 about 1,000 acres inside the yellow road,  
2 3,700 acres total across the whole reservation. So  
3 that's today.

4 Let's look at tomorrow. Okay. Let me  
5 step you back, because this is going faster than it  
6 needs to. Hang on. Let's fast forward to -- let's  
7 stay with this one here. All right, we're good.

8 Today, this is the first step as we make  
9 the first decision, which is the process buildings,  
10 D&D decision. So here you see all the buildings are  
11 gone inside Perimeter Road except for USEC and the  
12 DUF6 facilities. Plumes and landfills are there,  
13 and there's been no decision as to where the waste  
14 goes. If we made this D&D decision and just stop  
15 right there, that's what you would see as an interim  
16 step.

17 The next decision is where does the waste  
18 go. As Joel mentioned in his opening, the preferred  
19 remedy that's described in the proposed plan is to  
20 have an on-site solution. So there you see a brand  
21 new engineered on-site disposal facility and where  
22 it would be located. That represents about  
23 100 acres of land area. So think of the buildings  
24 in the 1,000 acre footprint shrinking down to about  
25 100 acres with the on-site decision. We'll talk

1 throughout this next couple of slides here as to why  
2 the facility is located up there.

3 In the next step, plumes and landfills are  
4 gone inside Perimeter Road. Once we make all five  
5 of those decisions that were on that previous table  
6 that are driven by these two legal documents, that  
7 is the final footprint that we would like to be at  
8 when both proposed plans and the preferred remedies  
9 are implemented. The buildings are gone, the  
10 landfills inside Perimeter Road are gone and the  
11 plumes are gone, and all of that winds up in the  
12 OSDC.

13 So I wanted to give you that snapshot of  
14 how all these decisions work together, and then  
15 we'll drill down to why we want to make these  
16 decisions and why they are the right call, to  
17 deliver that footprint.

18 Okay. So let's walk through the  
19 highlights of the process buildings decision here  
20 first. Basically, we look at two alternatives. One  
21 is called the no-action alternative, which we have  
22 to do by law, which says if you did nothing at all,  
23 didn't spend a dime and just let the plant, over the  
24 next decades, if not centuries, just fall apart,  
25 what would that look like and how unsafe that would

1 be. That's the trigger point, then, that the  
2 government uses to want to spend the money and  
3 allocate the money to, then, do the D&D process.  
4 You always use that as a comparison.

5 So we really have two alternatives here.  
6 The no-action and then the long title there is  
7 really the D&D decision, which is to remove the  
8 structures, treat the materials as necessary for  
9 disposal, and then package them for final  
10 disposition. But this does not make the disposal  
11 decision. So do nothing or D&D, is the way to think  
12 of that. The preferred alternative is to go with  
13 No. 2, and that's what you will see in there.

14 So let's talk, then, about what's inside  
15 the preferred alternative. There's a number of  
16 points made in the proposed plan for you to  
17 contemplate, but it's really these five that we  
18 think are worth highlighting here tonight. The  
19 first part of the decision is the D&D of the  
20 man-made structures. Now, does that mean is  
21 everything coming down? At this point, it is that.  
22 But there is a process in that decision. Right now,  
23 the buildings really have no future. They are 60  
24 years old. They are antiquated. There is just no  
25 identified reason to want to keep them at this

1 point, and there's no future for them.

2           However, if the future does present itself  
3 for any singular structure, say the admin building  
4 or something out there, there is a process to take a  
5 building and set it aside and save it, should that  
6 be the case. That's described in your proposed  
7 plan, and that piece of the decision would be kept  
8 by the Record of Decision, to save any structure, if  
9 the community wanted that.

10           There's also a real strong bent for  
11 recycling where we can. You basically have to look  
12 at every D&D project out there on its own merit, and  
13 make a decision as to whether -- what materials  
14 might be recycled as a part of that. So you'll see  
15 a real highlight on recycling in the proposed plan,  
16 and that will carry forward.

17           The third point there we make is about the  
18 recovery of barrier material. What does that mean?  
19 If you look inside the guts of the process equipment  
20 out there, where the uranium enrichment took place  
21 and those pieces of equipment are called converters,  
22 there's a lot of nickel inside there that can be  
23 recovered. It is contaminated, but the goal would  
24 be to take that -- crack those converters open, take  
25 that nickel out and set it aside for storage, with



1 the vision of someday, as nickel demand is  
2 increasing in the electronics industry and a variety  
3 of industries, it may make sense to decontaminate  
4 that nickel and get it back out as a valuable  
5 product. So with this decision, it is the agreement  
6 to go ahead and separate out that nickel barrier  
7 material and put it in storage, with the expectation  
8 that it may be recycled in the future.

9 Let's talk about the utilities out here,  
10 then. That's Point 4. We have to deactivate all of  
11 them, and then there is a decision, again, on a  
12 case-by-case basis, either to remove them as part of  
13 the D&D, or, perhaps, redistribute them to serve the  
14 other tenants that are out there, such as the ACP  
15 facilities and the DUF6. A lot of the utilities,  
16 gas lines and everything you can imagine, runs  
17 through the same buildings that are going to be  
18 D&D'd here, and the goal is to make sure that that  
19 utility structure stays active and works well for  
20 the other tenants that are at the site.

21 Lastly, it's to prepare the waste for  
22 final disposition, and that's where the decision,  
23 then, ends.

24 So there's just four points to highlight  
25 here as to why DOE prefers that decision. Certainly

1 leaving it out there to just rot away is unsafe.  
2 It's just there for comparison. Second, do I either  
3 save the buildings or do I D&D them? Without any  
4 useful life identified, the goal is to go ahead and  
5 D&D, again, with that provision that if we can save  
6 a building or two, if it so happens in the future  
7 that there's a demand to save them.

8 That goes hand-in-glove with Point 2, that  
9 if we just left them up -- that it's not safe to  
10 just leave them in place.

11 It's a safe and health-protective  
12 decision. A lot of these studies that go beyond  
13 into how you do it and execute it had to be done in  
14 concert with Ohio EPA, and we think we can do that  
15 safely, and it's the right thing to do for long-term  
16 protection of human health in the environment.

17 And then lastly, getting the D&D complete  
18 and getting that footprint clean goes hand-in-glove,  
19 I think, with the community's vision for  
20 redeveloping the area inside Perimeter Road.

21 Okay. Let's hit the highlights now on the  
22 waste disposition proposed plan. It's going to  
23 follow a similar format to what we just did in the  
24 last one.

25 First off, what were the alternatives? In

1 this case, three. No-action was, again, carried  
2 forward. By law, we have to do that. It's the same  
3 situation as with the previous one. It's not a safe  
4 thing to do, but it's a comparison thing to do on  
5 the money that would be allocated to drive this  
6 project.

7 The next two are the active alternatives.  
8 The first one, we'll probably nickname that the  
9 on-site decision, but it's really a combination of  
10 on-site and off-site, and we'll talk about how  
11 there's still an off-site element in that  
12 alternative here in a few minutes. We'll call it  
13 the combination alternative.

14 Lastly, Alternative 3 is the full off-site  
15 waste disposal alternative. We wouldn't have an  
16 on-site facility, and everything would be shipped to  
17 off-site facilities for burial elsewhere.

18 The preferred alternative, as you'll see  
19 in the plan, is No. 2. It's the combination of  
20 on-site and off-site waste disposal. That's the  
21 first time that's been daylighted to the public in  
22 these proposed plans. The technical evaluations  
23 provide the underpinning and looked at all the ways  
24 to evaluate these, but they did not make the remedy  
25 pick. These smaller documents today are where the

1 Department of Energy is telling you what their pick  
2 is for waste disposal, and it's Alternative 2.

3 So let's look at some of the key elements  
4 for the on-site alternative, and just kind of open  
5 up the highlights for you to contemplate here as you  
6 consider your comments and questions.

7 As we mentioned in those earlier slides,  
8 this is the final footprint we're trying to drive  
9 to. Having an on-site facility is the key for that.  
10 That's really the first ingredient that I wanted to  
11 identify for you here. Constructing an on-site  
12 disposal facility is the whole pivot point for how  
13 this works.

14 That would be up there in the northeast  
15 corner of the site, and we'll talk about why that's  
16 the preferred location here in a second. Again,  
17 that's about 100 acres up there. The area inside  
18 Perimeter Road is about 1,000, so it's a shrinkage  
19 of about ten-to-one, to take the buildings down and  
20 engineer a facility up there to receive them.  
21 Again, you see the landfills and plumes gone here,  
22 and we'll talk about that piece in just a second.

23 So what goes hand-in-glove with an on-site  
24 disposal decision, or any waste decision for that  
25 matter, anywhere? You have to set the criteria by

1       which that waste can be safely disposed of in that  
2       facility. A term of art for that in this business  
3       is WAC, which stands for waste acceptance criteria.  
4       But those are the criteria by which things can  
5       safely be disposed.

6                 We have already set those. The  
7       engineering and modeling evaluations and things that  
8       are in these documents is what put that in motion.  
9       As part of their concurrence process and approval  
10      process, Ohio EPA have approved those WAC, and they  
11      have to daylight those for you in this proposed  
12      plan. So if you were to look at this plan today and  
13      wonder what's in these three appendices, Appendix C  
14      is Ohio EPA's approved WAC summarized for you in  
15      that plan. So you can get a bird's eye view of that  
16      summary, and then those WACs become binding in that  
17      Record of Decision. So that is a key ingredient,  
18      and the waste comes in or goes in based on that  
19      acceptance criteria.

20                Hand-in-glove with that would be the  
21      off-site shipment of any waste that does not meet  
22      the WAC. And just in round numbers, when you look  
23      at this plan, you'll see a split of, I believe,  
24      84 percent to stay on-site and 16 percent would  
25      leave, based on our projections of waste that would

1 not meet the WAC. So just in round numbers, that's  
2 kind of the split. Okay?

3 Another key ingredient here is we can only  
4 accept in that facility the waste that's generated  
5 from the PORTS D&D process. No external waste can  
6 come here. I think that's been one of the views of  
7 the community for a long time. It's DOE's vision,  
8 and certainly ours, that nothing would come in that  
9 facility that wasn't generated from the PORTS D&D  
10 project and other things associated with PORTS.

11 And as you will hear about, we have some  
12 wonderful geology up there that makes this whole  
13 thing work. There may be a temptation in people's  
14 minds to say, well, geez, if you have such a nice  
15 world-class facility going in with great geology,  
16 there's a temptation there to bring waste from other  
17 facilities or other clean-ups in Ohio, things like  
18 that. I'll tell you right now, it's not the  
19 intention of anyone on the project, DOE, Ohio EPA or  
20 any of us, and that Record of Decision will ensure  
21 that it's the waste generated from the project only.

22 Just as we mentioned in the other proposed  
23 plan, there is a commitment for continued recycling  
24 and reuse of things that make sense. The nickel was  
25 just an example of that. We will have a series of

1 analyses done throughout the project as to what can  
2 and cannot be recycled effectively, and make sure  
3 that the future changes in what's deemed safe for  
4 recycling are accommodated by that decision. Those  
5 flexibilities will be in that Record of Decision and  
6 be able to accommodate a 10 to 20-year cleanup  
7 program with some of the changes, and how the world  
8 views recycling from a cleanup such as this.

9           Okay. This is a big one I wanted to  
10 mention here, so let's pay attention to this one. I  
11 think one of the great things about this particular  
12 Alternative 2, the combination on-site and off-site  
13 decision, is that decision gives us the opportunity  
14 to use soil from the existing landfills inside  
15 Perimeter Road and those groundwater plumes as fill  
16 material when we construct the OSDC and place the  
17 D&D waste.

18           Just in round numbers, for every one piece  
19 of D&D debris you have, one volume of debris, you  
20 need about two parts soil to place that and compact  
21 it effectively when you do the waste disposal  
22 operation. This is a world class project, in size.  
23 There's going to be about 1.4 million cubic yards of  
24 D&D debris generated when those buildings come down.  
25 Multiply that times two, and you can see how much

1 soil is needed to place that effectively. Why not  
2 use that soil from the landfills and plumes, rather  
3 than buying new soil, having it trucked in from  
4 external sources, having all those trucks on the  
5 road bringing in clean fill? Just go ahead and use  
6 what's available here.

7 So DOE has made a decision, and it's the  
8 right one. It's all been costed in here. It's a  
9 good business decision to go ahead and use soil from  
10 the landfills and plumes inside Perimeter Road to  
11 place that debris. We do talk about that in the  
12 plan. There are other authorizations we need from  
13 Ohio EPA down the road to execute that part of the  
14 decision, basically as to how to do it, how do you  
15 excavate the landfill safely, control air emissions,  
16 those kind of things. We still have to work through  
17 the decisions with Ohio EPA on how to do that. But  
18 the why, and the want to do that, all comes from  
19 this decision.

20 So DOE has made that commitment in here to  
21 go ahead and get those existing landfills and  
22 plumes, use them effectively as fill material and  
23 get them in that OSDC. There is language to that  
24 effect in this plan.

25 You'll also see an option, if needed, to



1 use clean fill to potentially supplement that. If  
2 there were some reason, 20 years into this project,  
3 or 15, where it just wasn't technically achievable  
4 to get those landfills done, DOE wanted to have an  
5 option to use clean fill should it arise. But right  
6 now, the commitment is to do them all inside  
7 Perimeter Road, it's been costed that way and it's  
8 been planned that way.

9 I think that's a wonderful opportunity  
10 to -- it's an indirect benefit, but the great  
11 benefit is the community's desire to have the area  
12 inside Perimeter Road redevelopable without any  
13 plumes and landfills in the way. It's really a  
14 give-back to the community once this is all wrapped  
15 up.

16 Okay. So how do you go about making a  
17 decision in where to locate something like this?  
18 This is a geologic cross-section, just basically a  
19 cartoon, if you will, of the underlying geology  
20 beneath the plant and in the surrounding hills that  
21 are on the margins of the plant. Those hills out  
22 there are bedrock hills. They are basically rock,  
23 with a thin cover of soil that supports the trees  
24 and everything up there, setting on bedrock.

25 The reason the OSDC is sited up there in

1 the northeast corner is to take advantage of all  
2 that bedrock, which is shale. It's a very low  
3 permeability-type rock that doesn't transmit water  
4 very effectively, and there's a lot of it up there.  
5 That's why we're over to that margin of the  
6 facility -- the whole property reservation.

7 Contrast that to where the plant is,  
8 there's an ancient river channel that kind of came  
9 through there in the glacial times and left a lot of  
10 sand and gravel and silt and loose deposits, and  
11 that's where all the groundwater is. Those plumes  
12 you see that are purple, that you see on that map,  
13 and that you saw earlier, those are all in the sand  
14 and gravel that's beneath that plant footprint. Get  
15 up into the bedrock hills, and you don't have that  
16 kind of groundwater situation.

17 There is one zone in there that I want to  
18 draw your attention to, which is the yellow one.  
19 That's known as the Berea sandstone. That is a  
20 water-transmitting rock formation down there,  
21 because it's sandstone. That transmits water where  
22 shale does not. That's the regional aquifer for the  
23 area here. That's a zone that we want to protect  
24 and monitor when all this goes in. So that yellow  
25 zone is worth noting.

1           The 175 feet of shale that exists above it  
2 that's protective, if you were to ask any  
3 hydrogeologist if this was a good site for something  
4 like this, he would say it's a great site. When  
5 you've got that much shale before you hit first  
6 groundwater, that's pretty impressive. So the whole  
7 thing moved towards that area.

8           There's an indirect benefit, too; not  
9 having that close to the plant site that we want to  
10 redevelop and the community would like, let's get it  
11 out of the way for redevelopment as well. There is  
12 a regulation on the books that when you site a  
13 disposal facility anywhere, either on-site or any  
14 new facility elsewhere, they always have to try to  
15 go to the best geology that's available to them. In  
16 our case, we're following exactly that. The best  
17 geology is up there in that northeast corner.

18           Let's talk about some of the design  
19 requirements to isolate the waste and permanently  
20 contain it up in that area. I want you to see two  
21 views here. We have one here that's basically at  
22 scale. The on-site disposal cell, these would be  
23 the exact height-to-width slopes and everything, how  
24 it would look in the environment. I just wanted to  
25 show it relative to that 175 feet of shale. Notice

1 that the Berea sandstone does underlie that shale.

2 Here's kind of an exaggerated view of the  
3 same thing. It's exaggerated 3:1. It's basically  
4 scrunched and looks a little taller than it would be  
5 in real life, so we can zoom in on some of the  
6 features. These are figures that are basically in  
7 your proposed plan, along with the same information.

8 I just wanted to highlight these, the cell  
9 cover system and the lining systems. There's models  
10 over there. The one on the left is the lining  
11 system, the one on the right is the capping system.  
12 Those are pretty much to scale. It's about a  
13 ten-foot engineered cap and a five-foot engineered  
14 liner that would sit beneath the facility here.  
15 Then there's some monitoring wells and different  
16 things beneath that site that are also shown near  
17 the bottom. So one is the lining necessary and one  
18 is the capping system.

19 Those are shown on here, but there's no  
20 choice given to us as to what layers goes into that.  
21 It's basically the state of the science that we have  
22 to follow, that the regulations have adopted, to  
23 make sure that the various layers are included here.  
24 There's a reason for having a lot of them.

25 You see that kind of real porous, grainy,

1 rock-looking stuff on the capped one, that's a good  
2 example. That's called a biotic barrier. That's a  
3 zone in there to prevent any roots from penetrating  
4 down and opening up anything through the cap,  
5 burrowing animals and things like that. There's all  
6 kind of layers that have a specific reason, that are  
7 picked by the regulations. Those regulations pull  
8 in the best science that the engineers can put out  
9 there to design facilities like this. We have  
10 elected to make sure we follow those regulations on  
11 every layer, and that's how they are starting to  
12 look for this facility.

13 I think that's the take-away there. I  
14 wanted you to see that at scale, and exaggerated to  
15 show some of the facility. There's a whole  
16 Appendix A to your proposed plan that goes into the  
17 engineering features in much more detail. That  
18 poster that you see there, that talks about what  
19 each particular layer does, that's actually in your  
20 Appendix A. You'll have that exact figure that  
21 describes these.

22 One more point that we wanted to make on  
23 this, is that the 100-acre area that will be  
24 dedicated for basically always, will remain under  
25 continued Federal ownership and will be an

1 institutionalized area, unavailable for development.  
2 That's kind of that 1,000 acres shrunk into 100  
3 story that I started with. That area will remain  
4 under continued Federal ownership, basically,  
5 indefinitely. It has to.

6 Hand-in-glove with that is the maintenance  
7 and monitoring to ensure performance. That has to  
8 continue over the life of this situation as well.  
9 So if you locate it correctly with the best geology,  
10 design it according to what the state of the art  
11 requires you to do, keep it under an  
12 institutionalized ownership arrangement and then  
13 maintain and monitor it, those are the ingredients  
14 that drives a successful on-site disposal  
15 opportunity.

16 Okay. A couple of regulatory  
17 considerations, and then I'm about done. We  
18 mentioned those ARARs that will be in that ROD.  
19 There's about 300 of them that affect this decision,  
20 for the design and operation of that facility and  
21 how you place all this waste safely. There's all  
22 kinds of things. We had to daylight the key ARARs  
23 in your proposed plan, so you can read about them  
24 there. Then the whole litany, all 300, will be  
25 activated when that ROD is finalized. So you do get

1 a quick summary of what the key ones are, like the  
2 design of the facility.

3 There's two that I want to call out here,  
4 that warrant special highlight tonight. In order to  
5 avail ourselves of the best geology up there in that  
6 northeast corner, it's impossible to not run into  
7 some of the streams and drainageways that are up  
8 there, the natural drainageways. There is one  
9 requirement in the Ohio Code to not site a facility  
10 like this within 200 feet of any streams.

11 But in order to get that best geology, we  
12 will get within 200 feet of some streams get right  
13 in the headwater of them. So Ohio EPA has worked  
14 with us to grant a waiver to that provision that  
15 minimizes the need to be within 200 feet. So it's  
16 basically a tradeoff. To get the best geology, you  
17 have to affect one of the streams and encroach on  
18 that 200 feet. So that waiver is daylighted in the  
19 proposed plan.

20 Ohio EPA has agreed to grant it, subject  
21 to public comment, and that's another thing you can  
22 comment about. Then once that's all settled, then  
23 that will be a formal piece of this Record of  
24 Decision, the granting of that waiver.

25 And then the second one I wanted to talk

1 about here is another regulation that's known as the  
2 Corrective Action Management Unit, known in our  
3 business as CAMU. Maria is going to talk a little  
4 bit about this. That's a regulation that's in the  
5 hazardous waste management regulations that the Ohio  
6 EPA director has at his disposal. He basically can  
7 allow a provision to set sensible, practical and  
8 health-protective treatment values for  
9 trichloroethylene, whenever you're moving to  
10 consolidate waste like our landfills and plumes.  
11 That regulation is there to compel all kinds of  
12 users around the state to not leave waste in place  
13 and just cap it and be done with it, but rather to  
14 try to consolidate it and move it to more protective  
15 situations.

16 The way they try to encourage that, to  
17 compel that, is by granting site-specific treatment  
18 values for hazardous waste. In this case,  
19 trichloroethylene, TCE, is a hazardous waste. They  
20 have worked with us to come up with a site-specific  
21 treatment value for that, so that will make the  
22 landfill and plume consolidation a reality for us.  
23 Part of that regulation is to daylight that for  
24 public comment as well, and Maria has a few slides  
25 in her presentation, seeking your public comment on



1 that decision as well. So those are two that were  
2 worth daylighting out of the 300, but all those go  
3 active with the ROD.

4 Okay. Here's my summary slide for why  
5 this is preferred. First off, we think it's a safe,  
6 protective and correct decision. And in working  
7 with Ohio EPA, it has to pass that as a threshold.  
8 This on-site decision could not even be on the table  
9 if it wasn't safe. So that's a threshold criteria.  
10 All the studies and the modeling and everything does  
11 support that as a safe and protective decision.

12 I think it's both reliable over the long  
13 term and uses proven technologies. We have to, as a  
14 finding, show that those type of design features do  
15 meet the state of the art that's required by the  
16 regulations, and those are proven from other sites  
17 that have been working at this for many decades, to  
18 figure out why to have so many layers and liners and  
19 how thick. We are just springboarding off the  
20 success of other sites.

21 And when it says "reliable over the long  
22 term," you'll see in there that we have to do  
23 modeling projections out to 1,000 years for the  
24 behavior of this. The question always arises, and I  
25 think I would have the same question, of why do you

1 stop at 1,000 years. You know, geology is out there  
2 longer than that. Why do you pick 1,000?

3 Basically, that's mankind's way of assuring himself  
4 that if he can design it for 1,000, it can basically  
5 perform indefinitely. That's how the regulation  
6 reads. So it's not like everyone is planning for  
7 this thing to fail at 1,000 years. It's basically  
8 mankind justifying to himself that he can expect  
9 this to just go on and be safe. So that's a key  
10 piece, when you see that 1,000 years in there. We  
11 have to cost it out to 1,000 years as well. That's  
12 why that term is in the regulations. It's an  
13 indefinite performing thing that mankind has to  
14 basically trust.

15 Let's talk about transportation risks here  
16 real quick, No. 5. If we were to pick  
17 Alternative 3, the full off-site one and not go with  
18 the combined one, there's roughly a two times  
19 greater chance of transportation risks, moving that  
20 much material on the highway to off-site disposal  
21 facilities, and four times the risk of a potential  
22 fatality with the amount of rail and truck transport  
23 that it would take to move 1.4 million cubic yards  
24 of material out to disposal facilities elsewhere.

25 So it's a factor in this decision. It is

1 safer from a transportation risk perspective to go  
2 on-site and have this remedy. It's less costly, and  
3 I think if you were to add up all the cost numbers  
4 in there and just get a summary statement, it's  
5 about a billion dollar difference to pick  
6 Alternative 2 over Alternative 3. And, likewise, it  
7 has the shortest time to complete the project and  
8 get the waste disposed. I would say it's about  
9 one-third faster to choose Alternative 2 than to do  
10 Alternative 3.

11 Lastly, I want to just highlight that this  
12 particular Alternative 2 does give us that  
13 opportunity to go after those landfills and plumes,  
14 and I think it's a great indirect benefit, then, to  
15 have the earlier transfer of property within  
16 Perimeter Road available for redeployment, which I  
17 think is one of the values that everyone has for  
18 this site.

19 That's it for me. I'm going to turn it  
20 over to Maria.

21 MS. GALANTI: Again, I want to thank  
22 everyone for coming out in the cold November air.  
23 My name is Maria Galanti, and if I speak funny, it's  
24 because I'm from Boston originally, so every once in  
25 a while, you will hear the Boston accent come

1 through.

2 I have been with Ohio EPA for 23 years,  
3 and I have been regulating this site for 23 years.

4 (Mr. Wagner handing Ms. Galanti a  
5 microphone.)

6 MS. GALANTI: Now you can hear me, and now  
7 you can hear the Boston accent.

8 So I'm going to talk to you a little bit  
9 about a CAMU, a Corrective Action Management Unit.  
10 As Marc said, it's a key component for their  
11 selected preferred alternative, Alternative 2.

12 So tonight, I'm here because we are  
13 seeking your written comment on the CAMU portion of  
14 DOE's preferred alternative. We will not be taking  
15 comments tonight. We're hoping that you will send  
16 us your written comments through the public comment  
17 period, which ends January 10th.

18 So tonight, part of this presentation is  
19 to let you know that we may designate, based on  
20 public comment, two CAMUs at this site. The first  
21 one would be the on-site disposal cell, and that  
22 would be considered a treatment storage and disposal  
23 CAMU. The second one would be the impacted  
24 materials transfer area, and that would be a storage  
25 and treatment CAMU.

1           What is a CAMU? Marc kind of talked about  
2           it a little bit. It's an area within the facility  
3           that will allow you to implement the remedy that is  
4           protective of human health and gives you a little  
5           bit more flexibility in how you manage hazardous  
6           waste. You can find all the information in the  
7           RI/FS, in a separate CAMU supplement in Appendix C  
8           of those proposed plans for waste disposition.

9           There were two -- we already talked about  
10          this, but there are two CAMUs at this site. One  
11          would be the OSDC. Again, that would be a treatment  
12          storage disposal, and that's where you would dispose  
13          of all the hazardous waste and all the environmental  
14          media. The other one is called the IMTA, and that's  
15          going to be an area outside of the OSDC, on-site  
16          disposal cell, where they would treat and store  
17          environmental hazardous waste.

18          And this is, again, an aerial of the site,  
19          and we're showing you where the OSDC is. Marc  
20          talked about that area being very protective. In  
21          that area of the OSDC, we believe it is protective  
22          and the geology and the additional tests we have  
23          done have proven that.

24          So, again, the CAMU regulations allow site  
25          managers to have greater flexibility in meeting

1 cleanup objectives. That's really important here,  
2 if you're going to be dealing with a lot of  
3 environmental media. The Director -- if DOE -- if  
4 the preferred alternative is on-site disposal, then  
5 the director can designate and may designate two  
6 CAMUs at this site, pending public comment.

7 When DOE came to us and they asked us  
8 about designating -- requested designation of the  
9 CAMU, we went through and talked with them about,  
10 you know, why is this necessary. It is necessary  
11 because it helps accelerate the cleanup. It  
12 provides a more comprehensive cleanup at the site  
13 and it will provide long-term protectiveness of  
14 human health and the environment in the remedy.

15 And, finally, I wanted to make this quick.  
16 Please submit all your written comments on the CAMU  
17 to myself, and my address is there, or you can send  
18 them to Justin Burke in our central office in  
19 Columbus. We will be receiving public comment,  
20 again, through January 10th.

21 MR. WAGNER: Michael Rubadue with the Ohio  
22 Department of Health.

23 MR. RUBADUE: Like Jeff says, I'm Mike  
24 Rubadue, Health Physicist with the Ohio Department  
25 of Health, Bureau of Radiation Protection.

1 I guess for those of you who are not  
2 familiar with our agency, our agency is tasked  
3 through the Ohio Revised Code through state law to  
4 regulate the radioactive materials in Ohio, and to  
5 protect the health of all Ohioans from the harmful  
6 effects of radiation.

7 Some of the ways we do that is through the  
8 licensure and inspection of the owners of  
9 radioactive material, such as hospitals, dentists,  
10 various manufacturers and so on and so forth.

11 Another thing that we do is we also track  
12 the generation of waste. We track the radioactive  
13 waste and we track the disposal of radioactive waste  
14 or the transport of waste in Ohio.

15 Also, we oversee the decommissioning of  
16 licensees in Ohio. When a facility decides they no  
17 longer have the need for radioactive material, we  
18 are -- my agency is the one that determines if their  
19 cleanup is sufficient to protect the public from  
20 access to that facility.

21 So because of our role in Ohio, we have  
22 partnered with Ohio EPA, we are their subject matter  
23 experts in the area of radiation protection. So we  
24 have worked hard with Ohio EPA reviewing -- they  
25 mentioned all the applicable, relevant and

1 appropriate rules, and basically we believe that if  
2 DOE and their contractors follow those rules, the  
3 on-site disposal cell and the decommissioning  
4 process will be protective.

5 MR. WAGNER: Mike, thank you.

6 Before we move into the Q&A session, I'm  
7 going to ask Jeanne Wilson, and Jeanne is with  
8 Senator Brown's office, to come up and make a  
9 statement, please.

10 MS. WILSON: Good evening. Can everyone  
11 hear me okay? Good.

12 I am here to speak on behalf of Senator  
13 Brown. He says, "I appreciate the opportunity to  
14 provide comments on the proposed plans for the  
15 site-wide waste disposition and process buildings  
16 and complex facilities decontamination and  
17 decommissioning projects at the Portsmouth Gaseous  
18 Diffusion Plant. Getting these plans right is  
19 essential. Actions at the site can help spur  
20 economic growth and opportunity for the region.

21 "That is why I believe that all actions at  
22 the site must be strongly informed by stakeholders  
23 in Piketon, Portsmouth and the surrounding  
24 communities as cleanup and redevelopment of the site  
25 is pursued.



1           "The proposed plan for site-wide waste  
2 disposition must conform to the tenets of  
3 Recommendation 13-02 of the Portsmouth Site Specific  
4 Advisory Board. Specifically, a future on-site  
5 disposal cell should accept no materials that  
6 originate from other locations; all waste generated  
7 from the ongoing depleted uranium hexafluoride  
8 operations at the site should not be disposed of at  
9 the proposed disposal cell; and all non-recoverable  
10 barrier material from process gas equipment should  
11 also be disposed of off-site.

12           "Additionally, I support efforts to  
13 achieve the site's full redevelopment potential by  
14 consolidating existing landfill and associated plume  
15 material from the site into the proposed disposal  
16 cell. The site and the community will fully realize  
17 the benefits of redevelopment if the Department of  
18 Energy closely follows the recommendations outlined  
19 by the Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board. I  
20 believe these plans provide an excellent opportunity  
21 to fulfill the Department of Energy's obligation to  
22 fully clean up the site while creating new economic  
23 opportunities in Pike, Scioto, Ross and Jackson  
24 Counties. These communities have been partners with  
25 the DOE for decades. And as this process moves

1 forward, it is essential that the DOE maintains that  
2 partnership and remains committed to working with  
3 the community and congressional delegation to keep  
4 decontamination and decommissioning cleanup on track  
5 and properly funded."

6 Thank you for this opportunity to offer  
7 remarks on behalf of Senator Brown. I also have a  
8 press release that has the full text of his remarks,  
9 and I'll have that at the table up front. Thank  
10 you, once again, and thank you, everyone, for coming  
11 out tonight.

12 MR. WAGNER: Ms. Wilson, we appreciate you  
13 coming out and representing the Senator.

14 With that, we'll go into the informal  
15 question and answer period. Again, this portion of  
16 the meeting is off the record, but it's an  
17 opportunity to ask questions of the panel up here  
18 about the presentation you just heard, as well as  
19 questions you might have after reviewing the  
20 proposed plan.

21 With that, I'll turn it over to Eric  
22 Roberts.

23 (Off the record for the question and  
24 answer session.)

25 (Recess taken.)

1 MR. ROBERTS: We're now going to open up  
2 the public comment section for the proposed plan for  
3 waste disposition.

4 First up, Blaine Beekman. And in the  
5 on-deck circle, David Hurd. If you will, wait by  
6 the table. Mr. Beekman, please step up to the  
7 microphone right there, in the middle. You'll have  
8 three to four minutes. I'll flag you down when you  
9 get close to four minutes.

10 MR. BEEKMAN: I'm Blaine Beekman, Pike  
11 County Commissioner. What I'm going to do is, very  
12 quickly, read you the letter and the resolution that  
13 the Commissioners of Pike County passed today.

14 "The Pike County Commissioners are pleased  
15 to comment on the Department of Energy's proposed  
16 plan for the disposal of waste to be produced from  
17 the decontamination and decommissioning of the  
18 Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant at Piketon.

19 "We have been deeply involved in this  
20 discussion for several years. We have been quite  
21 vocal in our concerns over the on-site waste cell.  
22 Our first reaction was negative, but after much  
23 discussion with DOE, members of our community and  
24 our fellow Commissioners in Jackson, Ross and Scioto  
25 Counties, we reached a consensus. We could accept

1 the low-level waste cell at Piketon if, in return,  
2 DOE would commit to a cleanup of the existing plumes  
3 and landfills on-site. That agreement has taken  
4 some time to materialize, but this document appears  
5 to cover the main points.

6 "Of critical importance is the summary of  
7 the preferred alternative on Page 3. The  
8 recommended choice is Alternative 2, because it  
9 protects human health, safety and the environment.  
10 This is a particular interest to those Pike  
11 Countians who live near the Piketon facility.  
12 Commissioner Teddy West's property directly abuts  
13 the DOE reservation. Rumors of dangerous  
14 contamination in the existing landfills and leaking  
15 plumes have produced longstanding concerns. The  
16 second paragraph on Page 12 goes in to greater  
17 specificity, including the statement that, 'It is  
18 DOE's choice to use contaminated fill.' When one  
19 adds in the cost savings of Alternative 2, we agree  
20 with DOE that this is the correct approach for  
21 Piketon.

22 "We certainly do not support the No-Action  
23 Alternative 1 nor Alternative 3. We have determined  
24 over the past three years that the best plan for the  
25 future of Pike County is the future vision worked

1 out by DOE and Fluor, which would allow for the  
2 cleanup of the existing plumes and landfills and the  
3 future reindustrialization of the site. Alternative  
4 3 does not address the plume and landfill issue.  
5 The failure to deal with this particular issue would  
6 leave several hundred acres of the proposed  
7 reindustrialization site unusable. Nor would it  
8 deal with the long-term community health threats  
9 presented by the continued presence of those plumes  
10 and landfills.

11 "We appreciate the efforts of DOE and the  
12 Ohio EPA to work toward a practical plan for the  
13 cleanup at Piketon. We're happy to support the  
14 program outlined in this document. Sincerely, Harry  
15 Rider, Teddy West, Blaine Beekman, Pike County  
16 Commissioners."

17 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, sir.

18 (Court reporter addressing the public  
19 about requirements.)

20 MR. ROBERTS: Before Mr. Hurd goes, I want  
21 to remind everyone that we are having two formal  
22 comment periods tonight; one on the waste  
23 disposition path forward, and one on the process  
24 building D&D path forward. This is the comment  
25 period for the waste disposition path. Primarily

1 this is the one more people were interested in  
2 commenting on, so we wanted to make sure we were  
3 responsive to the majority of the community.

4 If you asked to speak to both comment  
5 periods, we'll call your name twice. If you don't  
6 hear your name, that's because you had signed up for  
7 the other one.

8 So, we have Mr. David Hurd followed by  
9 Dick Snyder.

10 MR. HURD: My name is David Hurd. I'm  
11 from Jackson County, east of here. I am here to  
12 support the proposed waste disposal site on the Pike  
13 County plant.

14 MR. ROBERTS: Could you say that again in  
15 the mic?

16 MR. HURD: I'm here to support the waste  
17 disposal site here on the Pike County Uranium  
18 Enrichment Plant.

19 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

20 We have Dick Snyder followed by Mark  
21 Johnson.

22 MR. SNYDER: My name is Dick Snyder. I'm  
23 a former member of the SSAB. I'll be presenting a  
24 recommendation that I worked on when I was a member  
25 of the SSAB. It was submitted in May of this

1 year -- I'm sorry, May of '13.

2 The one thing I want to emphasize for the  
3 benefit of this recommendation is -- there's several  
4 points on there that I would like to read off and  
5 make sure that they become part of the record.

6 The first one, the SSAB requested no new  
7 waste generated from off-site locations be placed in  
8 any Portsmouth OSDC. That makes sense because we  
9 don't want stuff from Savannah River and we don't  
10 want stuff from Hanford, because it's a lot  
11 different character than our stuff that we're  
12 putting in the OSDC.

13 The second item was the PORTS EM SSAB  
14 requests all contaminated plumes be exhumed and  
15 remediated in a manner that allows for future  
16 reindustrialization without unnecessary restrictions  
17 at those locations. There was about ten areas that  
18 were impacted with that.

19 The third point, it's recommended that all  
20 known landfills within Perimeter Road, as identified  
21 in the Waste Disposition Remedial  
22 Investigation/Feasibility Study, or the RI/FS, be  
23 consolidated into the on-site disposal cell and  
24 remediated in a manner that allows for future  
25 reindustrialization at those locations. If

1 radiological material exists in any of the currently  
2 capped landfills that does not meet the numerical  
3 and administrative waste criteria, it must be  
4 disposed of off-site.

5 The fourth item is, it's requested that  
6 all barrier material, excluding that of the 326  
7 building, be segregated for the potential recovery  
8 of its valuable nickel. Now, I understand there was  
9 some discussion on the actual assay percentage of  
10 some of that, and that Fluor-B&W will be looking  
11 into that. If the recovery of the nickel material  
12 is not deemed to be financially advantageous or  
13 achievable, it is requested that all barrier  
14 material be disposed off-site. Such a determination  
15 regarding the reuse of the nickel assets shall be  
16 made in the near term and shall not exceed the next  
17 five years for a finalized plan. Final disposition  
18 shall not expand beyond ten years for all of the  
19 recovered nickel to be reused/recycled and be  
20 removed from the Piketon site.

21 The next bullet is, it is requested that  
22 all current and existing waste from the depleted  
23 uranium hexafluoride conversion operation be  
24 disposed of off-site, as these are known to contain  
25 highly toxic and radiological contaminants.



1           The last item is, it is requested that the  
2           DOE fund an implementable land use plan, as was done  
3           for the Miamisburg Mound Complex, resulting in a  
4           usable end state for whatever reuse opportunities  
5           becomes available. It is requested that this plan  
6           incorporate green space and esthetics as a component  
7           of design.

8           MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Snyder.

9           We have Mark Johnson, followed by Val  
10          Francis.

11          MR. JOHNSON: My name is Mark Johnson, and  
12          I'm the business manager for the Tri-State Buildings  
13          and Construction Trades Council.

14          We represent 33 counties in three states,  
15          and the total membership is about 20,000 members.  
16          Our jurisdiction goes from the coal fields of  
17          Southern West Virginia to Eastern Kentucky to north  
18          of Chillicothe, as far up river as Pomeroy, Ohio,  
19          down to Manchester, Ohio. We serve a lot of  
20          industrial customers in the tri-state area,  
21          including the Department of Energy.

22          I would like to thank everybody for all  
23          the efforts that's been put in to this, the various  
24          studies in the engineering of the disposal cell. We  
25          believe that it's highly engineered.

1 I personally have read the proposal from  
2 page to page and talked to many people in the  
3 industry. I believe it's the safe option. Many  
4 people in this room believes it's the safe option.  
5 It will create a lot of extra, positive economic  
6 jobs. There will be hundreds of jobs created by the  
7 preferred option. Also, there will be hundreds of  
8 jobs created with dealing with the plumes and the  
9 existing landfills.

10 I just want to say that we support the  
11 preferred option. Also, that we want to get the  
12 Record of Decision to be made as quickly as  
13 possible. I believe that funding for the site  
14 depends on us getting this Record of Decision, and  
15 we support the option. Thank you.

16 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. We  
17 appreciate your comments.

18 Val Francis followed by Ralph Beatty.

19 MR. FRANCIS: Good evening, gentlemen.  
20 Good to see all four of you here. It's good to know  
21 all of you. I have some comments. I am usually  
22 noted for statements instead of speeches, but I  
23 wrote a few things down and I want you to listen to  
24 these.

25 My name is Val Francis and I've written

1 these thoughts down, and I want to -- just some of  
2 these points, I want you to remember.

3 I want to start by saying that as a local  
4 community member for 62 years now, I appreciate the  
5 level of effort DOE has put into providing  
6 information to this community, including the  
7 Portsmouth SSAB, which I have had the privilege to  
8 be a part of since its inception, our local  
9 officials and others.

10 I don't think there is much more that I  
11 can say that hasn't already been said pertaining to  
12 SSAB and the recommendation in 13-02. That  
13 recommendation outlines fully the fact that we, as  
14 SSAB and as a community, we're not crazy about a  
15 nuclear facility in our community. But we do  
16 understand that the OSDC can be beneficial to the  
17 community if DOE meets certain conditions.

18 As you well know, we have had a lot of  
19 back-and-forth discussions pertaining to the  
20 conditions with DOE and with Ohio EPA. We have  
21 understood the regulatory process did not allow for  
22 the kind of commitment that we would really like to  
23 see in the language within the proposed plan.

24 Just so that I won't be too ambiguous, and  
25 I don't want to be redundant, either, but I want to

1 speak to some of the 13-02s again. The community  
2 does expect that no waste from other off-site  
3 locations will be placed in the OSDC. The community  
4 expects all contaminated plumes within Perimeter  
5 Road be remediated in a manner that allows for  
6 reindustrialization of the site. The community  
7 expects all landfills within Perimeter Road to be  
8 remediated in a manner that allows for  
9 reindustrialization.

10 We have spoken to the idea of the valuable  
11 nickel, and if it can be recovered, we want that to  
12 actually happen. To be clear, we also do not want  
13 any barrier materials to be placed in the OSDC. And  
14 at no time, should any depleted uranium hexafluoride  
15 materials be included in this OSDC. These are  
16 points that have been made already this evening.  
17 I'm just reiterating them again.

18 Lastly, on this particular part, the  
19 committee expects DOE to fund a land use plan that  
20 results in a usable end-state, that incorporates  
21 green space and esthetics as part of the design.

22 So really, it comes down to this,  
23 gentlemen. It comes down to some of the  
24 conversations that we have had in the past. It  
25 comes down to trust. The question that I want to

1 ask you is this, can this community trust the U.S.  
2 Department of Energy to do what it says? Can we  
3 trust that language in those documents, that it's  
4 not too flimsy, and it won't be used later as a  
5 mechanism not to fulfill the promises that are being  
6 presented tonight to the folks that are here, and to  
7 this community.

8 We need to continue to make sure that we  
9 have a general and a genuine dialogue related to  
10 this -- to these positions and related to the  
11 condition that allows the future, when you're gone,  
12 and most of us here are gone, that if it takes a  
13 40-year plan to do this, that it, indeed, is what we  
14 say.

15 So I ask this question. Can we trust you?  
16 I believe that we probably can. I shouldn't say  
17 probably. We can. Let me reiterate just a little  
18 bit why. I really believe that if this community  
19 raises the level of this game that we're all a part  
20 of, the DOE has just as much skin in this game as  
21 anyone does in this D&D project.

22 I don't believe that the DOE would be  
23 foolish enough to renege on its part of the deal.  
24 And I really believe the credibility of the  
25 Department, including Mr. Bradburne, Mr. Adams,

1 Mr. Murphie, Bill Murphie, who is not here this  
2 evening. Your credibility is on the line, too, as  
3 being a part of this whole process.

4 MR. ROBERTS: About 30 seconds.

5 MR. FRANCIS: All right. I also want to  
6 make a statement to the Ohio EPA and the Ohio  
7 governor's office. The community's position on this  
8 issue could not be any clearer. Our state  
9 regulators and political bodies also know exactly  
10 what this community expects as this D&D project  
11 moves forward, and we expect them to hold DOE  
12 accountable to their end of the bargain. We want no  
13 excuses that your role is only technical. We expect  
14 you to ensure that our interests are protected.

15 One final statement pertaining to, really,  
16 the people of southern Ohio, which you have gotten  
17 to know. Dennis, we almost consider you as part of  
18 southern Ohio.

19 MR. CARR: I am part of it.

20 MR. FRANCIS: But I don't want us to be  
21 mistaken as naive because of who we are. We are the  
22 poorest county in the State of Ohio. We are  
23 reasonable people, smart people, willing partners to  
24 work with DOE and Ohio EPA to make this project work  
25 in an efficient way that benefits this community in

1 the years ahead.

2 So in closing, I hope that if you look  
3 back on this exercise in the years ahead, we can  
4 understand that DOE did what they said they would  
5 do, that they met the promises that this community  
6 expects them to. Thank you.

7 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Val.

8 Ralph Beatty followed by Frank Halstead.

9 MR. BEATTY: I'm Ralph Beatty, a member of  
10 the Ohio Operating Engineers. I live in Jackson  
11 County. We do support the proposed plan for the  
12 on-site state-wide waste distribution. Thank you.

13 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Beatty.

14 Mr. Halstead followed by Ricky Miles.

15 MR. HALSTEAD: My name is Frank Halstead.  
16 I was a member of SSAB for the past six years. In  
17 the practice of being on that Board, we made  
18 recommendations. One is 10-06. That was done on  
19 November 4th, 2010.

20 I'm just going to read a short portion of  
21 this recommendation. The recommendation was that  
22 DOE EM SSAB recommends that DOE continue to study  
23 waste disposition alternatives. As part of this  
24 study, DOE should look at positive impacts of  
25 recycling and waste minimization. This study should

1 include, but not be limited to, waste stabilization,  
2 recycling, metal smelting, compaction and shredding  
3 as a means of minimizing waste volumes. In  
4 addition, DOE should investigate scenarios for  
5 creating multiple, smaller cells as an alternative  
6 to one large disposal cell. It is recommended that  
7 a cost comparison of all options be provided. Thank  
8 you very much.

9 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, sir.

10 Ricky Miles and then Norman Brooks, Jr.

11 MR. MILES: My name is Ricky Miles. I'm a  
12 Special International Rep for Laborers International  
13 Union of North America. I support the proposed  
14 plan, Alternative 2, as written.

15 For the last ten years, I've worked  
16 environmental cleanup of DOE sites. I've worked the  
17 Hanford site in Washington State, Idaho Falls site  
18 in Idaho, and the Oak Ridge Site in Tennessee. All  
19 of these DOE sites have on-site disposal cells which  
20 are absolutely necessary for the cleanup of these  
21 massive sites. Each one exceeds 4,000 acres of  
22 footprint.

23 I fully support the construction of an  
24 on-site disposal cell for Portsmouth, because  
25 without it, the site cannot be cleaned up. Without



1 the cleanup of the site, reindustrialization is  
2 impossible.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, sir. We  
4 appreciate your comments.

5 We have Norman Brooks, Jr. and Jim McGraw.

6 MR. BROOKS: Good evening. I would like  
7 to first start by saying my name is Norman Brooks,  
8 Jr. I'm from Scioto County. I live here. I am in  
9 full and total support of the proposed plans for the  
10 process buildings, as well as other complex  
11 buildings to deal with the D&D project. Thank you.

12 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, sir. We  
13 appreciate your comments.

14 We have Jim McGraw, and CJ Blevins is on  
15 deck.

16 MR. MCGRAW: My name is Jim McGraw. I'm  
17 from Scioto County. I have reviewed both proposed  
18 plans and I am in full support of both plans. Thank  
19 you.

20 MR. ROBERTS: We have CJ Blevins, followed  
21 by Vina Colley.

22 MR. BLEVINS: CJ Blevins from Scioto  
23 County. I am in full support of the preferred plan.

24 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, sir.

25 Ms. Vina Colley followed by Dan Minter.

1 MS. COLLEY: Hi, I'm Vina Colley. I  
2 represent PRESS, Portsmouth Piketon Residents for  
3 Environmental Safety and Security, and National  
4 Nuclear Workers for Justice.

5 I have been fighting this facility for  
6 cleanup now for, gosh, since about '85, '86. It's  
7 been devastating watching my coworkers, my community  
8 and people that I love pass away from cancer and all  
9 these illnesses. It's also devastating to watch the  
10 workers who worked here at this plant back in the  
11 '80s and the '90s still fighting for their  
12 compensation.

13 I am not for this waste cell. No. 1, we  
14 have a bedrock that has infractions.

15 No. 2, the cell that they had at Fernald  
16 got a cut in the lining and they had to go in and  
17 fix it. You can't guarantee me that this cell isn't  
18 going to leak. I'm not for demo -- just going in  
19 and destroying these buildings. They have to be  
20 taken apart piece by piece by piece. This facility  
21 was on the Superfund list -- it didn't make the  
22 Superfund list, but we dealt with it, and they sold  
23 it without the consent agreement. So none of the  
24 workers at this facility are being told that this  
25 facility here is one of the worst facilities for

1       contamination.

2                   I wasn't prepared for a speech tonight,  
3       but it's been over one year since you've had public  
4       participation, to where people could really  
5       understand what you're doing.

6                   Now you can get all the commissioners in  
7       Jackson and all the surrounding counties to come in  
8       here and say what we want. We want jobs and we want  
9       cleanup. We have never been for shutting down this  
10      plant. Because if we continue to do this cell,  
11      there's no guarantee that we're not going to be the  
12      national dump place in the United States. I have  
13      saw the list of the facilities that aren't going to  
14      be a dump site, but our name is not on that site.

15                  We have -- I read a story through Mary  
16      Perdium (phonetic) that we had plutonium at the site  
17      in 1999 when we weren't supposed to have plutonium.  
18      Because of the plutonium, they downplayed the  
19      problems with the plutonium. We had it shipped in  
20      here from West Valley, New York, from Paducah, from  
21      Hanford, and it got played down that plutonium and  
22      neptunium are here.

23                  It's really heartbreaking to know that  
24      these workers, who are new workers right now, will  
25      not be in the compensation bill because they cut

1 that compensation off in '92. And the workers are  
2 still sick -- like myself, they are still sick and  
3 still fighting this compensation bill.

4 So can you guarantee me that these workers  
5 aren't going to be exposed to this plutonium that's  
6 being covered up, and this neptunium, plus all the  
7 other toxic chemicals that you have?

8 Like I said, I just found out about the  
9 meeting and it hasn't been long enough to go over  
10 all of this. I don't know how we're going to get  
11 rid of the waste. I don't know if we can just put  
12 it on a concrete pad, put it up there where we can  
13 watch it and monitor it. If you want to tear the  
14 buildings apart, then these workers are going to  
15 have to take their time and go pipe-by-pipe. Inside  
16 these pipes in those process buildings, the 330, the  
17 333 and the 326, we have polychlorinated biphenyl,  
18 which is called PCB. In these PCBs, we have  
19 plutonium, uranium, neptunium and all the  
20 radioactive daughters.

21 MR. ROBERTS: You have about 30 seconds.

22 MS. COLLEY: Okay. We have had 15  
23 earthquakes since 1975, I think. Fifteen  
24 earthquakes. We have already got a bedrock  
25 underneath this facility that's also a

1 groundwater -- Teays River Valley that we're sitting  
2 on. We have already got an infraction of the  
3 bedrock, and you want to put this cell underground.  
4 It just blows my mind.

5 I would like to see you come to  
6 Portsmouth -- I would also like to see you go out in  
7 the community and go door-to-door to these poor  
8 people that are sick and tell them that you're  
9 trying to make a dump site out of this facility.  
10 And there will be no jobs, no jobs, once you put all  
11 this waste in that cell. So if you guys want jobs,  
12 you better fight and say you don't want that cell.

13 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Ms. Colley.

14 Dan Minter followed by Jeff Browning.

15 MR. MINTER: I'm Dan Minter. I'm a life  
16 resident here of Pike County. I actually went to --  
17 lived at the Research Center there. Before it was a  
18 Research Center, it was a family farm. I graduated  
19 from this high school. So when I say I'm from Pike  
20 County, I'm from Pike County.

21 I also served on the SSAB from its  
22 inception. I'm also the Vice-Chairman of the  
23 Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative as well.

24 Given that, you heard a couple comments  
25 about Recommendation 13-2. I'll kind of go back in

1 history a little bit. When SSAB was formed, there  
2 were discussions about on-site disposal and off-site  
3 disposal and back and forth. I think for quite a  
4 bit of time, I don't think anyone said that we  
5 wanted a disposal cell. We tried to find a balanced  
6 approach. There's been a lot of good work on the  
7 effort to find alternatives and something that could  
8 be balanced.

9 We have these other disposal cells, or  
10 these plumes that you have heard about, inside  
11 Perimeter Road, that are, in some cases, 20 years or  
12 older. Those designs are not lined cells. By  
13 moving those to an on-site disposal cell that is  
14 lined could make that more protective, to use that  
15 property for reuse and economic development in the  
16 future.

17 Ultimately, if we could have none of that  
18 waste, have no environmental impact at any time,  
19 that certainly would be the preferred option. It's  
20 just not the cards that we're dealt.

21 With that, the SSAB also recommended in  
22 13-02 that conditions would be placed on any  
23 requirement for an on-site disposal cell. One of  
24 the concerns that I have is making sure that those  
25 are firm commitments. Obviously, the on-site

1 disposal cell, when constructed, hopefully -- with  
2 the consolidation of the existing plumes and  
3 landfills, those are permanent processes. That's  
4 what the hope would be, obviously, that they do get  
5 cleaned up.

6 The language currently in the proposed  
7 plan is certainly not as firm as I would like to  
8 see. I would like the words "shall" and "will" as  
9 opposed to "option" or "choice". I would like to  
10 see those changed in the final process. I think  
11 that's important that we have a balanced approach.

12 We have -- the Ohio University looked at  
13 the study and looked at the site for reuse. There's  
14 a tremendous amount of support for future use.  
15 That's only possible if we end up with a facility  
16 with the proper infrastructure and cleaned up to the  
17 level necessary to reuse.

18 So to meet those objectives and to meet  
19 what I find is an overwhelming interest of the  
20 community, this is an objective that's important to  
21 meet those goals. It's important to the Department,  
22 it's important to this community. And I do think  
23 the language does need to be strengthened.

24 I would ask our political representatives  
25 to -- they certainly could help in that area. We

1 have several of our senators and Congresspersons  
2 here tonight, or staff members with their offices.  
3 Making it very clear that the funding here would be  
4 directed towards that activity would be important to  
5 meet that objective. So not only the language in  
6 the final Record of Decision that the SSAB has  
7 recommended in 13-2, but it's also important from  
8 the standpoint of funding.

9 If we can meet those objectives, we have  
10 an opportunity to have a lot of interest and have a  
11 process that we can move forward with. With that,  
12 that is my comment.

13 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Dan.

14 Jeff Browning followed by Will Henderson.

15 MR. BROWNING: My name is Jeff Browning.  
16 I was with Local 265 in Cincinnati for 18 years.  
17 Eleven years, I spent at Fernald. Nine years, I was  
18 there building landfills. I support the landfills.  
19 They are safe. I was in there every day from the  
20 day they opened -- turned the dirt over in Cell 1  
21 until we capped Cell 1 in 2006.

22 They are safe if they are done right.  
23 They are a double-lined system. There's a lot more  
24 things than you realize. They are built very safe,  
25 and there's so many specs that you have got to go



1 by. It's not just digging a hole in the ground. So  
2 I support them.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

4 We have Will Henderson, Chair of the  
5 Portsmouth SSAB, followed by Carlton Cave.

6 MR. HENDERSON: Hello. My name is Will  
7 Henderson. We're in support of the on-site disposal  
8 cell. I just want to talk about a few points.

9 Obviously, economic development for this  
10 region is extremely important. We feel like the  
11 on-site disposal cell takes that into consideration  
12 and allows a large portion of the current site to be  
13 redeveloped. That was one of the key criteria as we  
14 went through the process of 13-02.

15 Additionally, we definitely want to make  
16 sure that we go about the research and develop new  
17 ways to potentially reduce the footprint of the  
18 on-site disposal cell, as it's currently planned, by  
19 looking at the suspension. And of the suspensions  
20 that are going to be looked at in the future, we  
21 would like to have some of the material that exists  
22 inside of the process buildings looked at for reuse  
23 and recycling purposes. Thank you.

24 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Will. Appreciate  
25 your comments there.

1 Carlton Cave followed by Jeff Walburn.

2 MR. CAVE: My name is Carlton Cave. I'll  
3 be speaking to Recommendation 10-01. It reads as  
4 thus. "The Portsmouth EM Site Specific Advisory  
5 Board recommends that the DOE go forward with the  
6 use of an Ohio-based institution of higher learning  
7 for the process of conducting a community-wide  
8 end-use study. The SAAB feels that it is imperative  
9 that DOE consider the following items crucial to the  
10 success of this endeavor; engaging community groups  
11 to facilitate a dialogue to identify questions,  
12 concerns and education needs related to PORTS;  
13 establishing methods and opportunities by which  
14 community members can participate and contribute to  
15 the planning of and activities ongoing at PORTS.  
16 Examples of methods are structured involvement,  
17 empowerment education models and community-based  
18 communication methods. And allowing collaboration  
19 with the community on program development and  
20 implementation. Recommendation 10-01. Thank you.

21 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Cave.

22 Jeff Walburn, followed by Steve Nickell.

23 MR. WALBURN: My name is Jeff Walburn.  
24 I'm here representing myself. The previous comment  
25 that I made, I wanted to make that clear. I've had

1 many discussions -- I'll just bring up Hanford,  
2 Washington and the current problem at Hanford,  
3 Washington.

4 I've had many discussions with Senator  
5 Wyden, and Dave Becker, who is on his finance  
6 committee, who is a state away. So the State of  
7 Oregon is very interested in what the State of  
8 Washington and their federal facility is doing.

9 You had whistle-blowers, Walt Tamosaitis  
10 and Donna Bush. Walt Tamosaitis was a 41-year  
11 engineer on-site, worried about safety, lived at the  
12 site, loved his community. He tells the  
13 subcontractors and DOE, you're off on your factoring  
14 plutonium and your waste tanks. They were off by a  
15 factor of ten. That's a problem when you can't  
16 estimate your plutonium on-site, being off by a  
17 factor of ten. Walt Tamosaitis has just gotten the  
18 first whistle-blower case that we know of against a  
19 DOE subcontractor relationship.

20 The burial of this material on the Piketon  
21 site is not an option. We have qualified workers  
22 led by Herman Potter, that are highly qualified,  
23 giving the input in how the work is to progress.  
24 Charles Lawson and myself have been on the 20-year  
25 investigation of DOE and their subcontractors and

1 regulatory oversight of this site. We know what  
2 they say and we know what they do.

3 Now, because of this investigation that  
4 people know that we're on, people from the plant  
5 now -- Herman don't know who they are. They come  
6 and fall down -- my collar is red, it's not white.  
7 People fall down on their knees and start making  
8 admissions of criminal wrong, or things that they  
9 were told to do, that they know is not proper. And  
10 they are going to their union officials and their  
11 union officials have to make a deal with the devil  
12 to get work.

13 They are telling us these things and we're  
14 saying, "Stand up. Straighten your back and stand  
15 up." They say, "Well, we don't want things to  
16 happen to us like they were happening to you, being  
17 threatened with your life," like with Charles Lawson  
18 and myself. Or to have to testify in the United  
19 States Senate about wrongdoings of DOE and their  
20 subcontractors who are not to be trusted, and  
21 incestuous relationships. And that -- that is a  
22 quote from the USW magazine.

23 Now, when people here come up, all of the  
24 different locals -- I know you want work. We all  
25 want work. But I have reports of previous

1 remediation workers at the Portsmouth site that DOE  
2 lost all their records. Well, now when these people  
3 go to get benefits, sorry, we don't have your  
4 records. We lost them.

5 Or that they were taped over, as in our  
6 workforce. Our dose histories were supposed to be  
7 kept for 30 years and one day, taped over by  
8 mistake. Racks and racks of previous dosage history  
9 taped over by mistake, and only a \$2,500 fine by  
10 OSHA. Only a \$2,500 fine?

11 MR. ROBERTS: You have about 30 seconds,  
12 Mr. Walburn.

13 MR. WALBURN: In wrapping up, I would like  
14 to know how a worker right now, knowing that  
15 something is wrong -- many of the workers that are  
16 old heads, gray beards that know right from wrong,  
17 that worked in the 700, worked in the 705, worked in  
18 the process when it was active, are saying, "Man, I  
19 had to get out. We were doing some wrong things."  
20 They were cutting pipes and dropping them and doing  
21 some unsafe acts. And these young guys are coming  
22 in here that just want work, and they are saying,  
23 "Well, I have to do it. They told me."

24 They are not like Walt Tamosaitis, who is  
25 a 41-year engineer that can make a living. They

1 have to depend on the honesty of DOE.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Walburn. We  
3 appreciate your comments.

4 Steve Nickell. Is Steve here?

5 FROM FLOOR: No.

6 MR. ROBERTS: We're going to slide  
7 forward. Kevin Shoemaker. I apologize for the  
8 short notice. Kevin Shoemaker and then Jody  
9 Crabtree.

10 MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm used to short jokes,  
11 so that was okay.

12 Quite frankly, I'm here on behalf of  
13 Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative. I'm their  
14 counsel. I'm here to speak to the alternatives.

15 The Southern Ohio Diversification  
16 Initiative supports the alternative that was  
17 selected by the Department of Energy on the  
18 condition that the groundwater plumes and the  
19 landfills are cleaned up and consolidated. The  
20 difficulty becomes in the language that's used in  
21 the plan. The language that's used in the plan is  
22 permissive and allows several ways for the  
23 Department of Energy to kind of back out of things.

24 To kind of echo what Dan Minter said and  
25 what Val Francis said, is that that's an important

1 piece of this. The problem right now is that it's  
2 all based upon trust. As I read the plan as a  
3 lawyer, it's pretty clear to me that lawyers wrote  
4 that. I don't think anybody is going to trust  
5 lawyers. Unfortunately, the only people trusted  
6 less than lawyers are Congress and the  
7 administration.

8 So at this point in time, the way to fix  
9 this plan and the way to fix the ROD is to include  
10 mandatory language that says the Department "shall"  
11 do certain things, as opposed to "it may," or where  
12 it has a lot of things where it can back out of  
13 those obligations. Those obligations affect people.  
14 They are not just -- this just isn't land. It's  
15 just not buildings. It's just not those things.  
16 They affect people.

17 The health and safety that is placed into  
18 this particular alternative is based upon the  
19 cleaning up of those plumes and landfills. And the  
20 four people, and more than this, that are sitting at  
21 this table, we have great confidence in. That's not  
22 the problem. The problem is, as this gets further  
23 away from the people sitting here, it starts to get  
24 to people who couldn't find Piketon on a map.  
25 That's the concern.

1           We are requesting, as the Southern Ohio  
2           Diversification Initiative, that mandatory language  
3           go into that ROD that says very clearly that those  
4           plumes will be cleaned up and that the landfills  
5           will be consolidated. Otherwise, all we have is a  
6           promise.

7           I just recall that when my daughter was  
8           little, she would always look at me after I promised  
9           something and she would say, "A promise is a  
10          promise, Dad." So I got to the point where I always  
11          used language like that's in that plan, that kind of  
12          left me an out, to say, "It wasn't really a promise.  
13          I said that we might go do this."

14          Our problem is, from the Southern Ohio  
15          Diversification Initiative, for the things we do for  
16          the community, to try to help this community, we  
17          would request that there be absolute mandatory  
18          language in the plan, in the ROD, and we know that  
19          you folks at this table support that.

20          MR. ROBERTS: Thank you for your comments,  
21          Mr. Shoemaker.

22          Jody Crabtree followed by Chick Lawson.

23          MR. CRABTREE: Jody Crabtree. I'm a  
24          life-long resident of Pike County. I'm in full  
25          support of the preferred alternative of the on-site



1 disposal cell. Thank you.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, sir.

3 Mr. Lawson, followed by Herman Potter.

4 MR. LAWSON: Chick Lawson. I live in  
5 Scioto County, in Lucasville. I was an employee out  
6 here at the plant.

7 Talking about trust, as the individual  
8 just -- this other man. Right now, I do not trust  
9 DOE, and there's actual reasons for that. I was an  
10 OSHA certified investigator. DOE allowed them to  
11 destroy all our health -- our radiation records.  
12 They allowed them to put them through a wood  
13 chipper, which allowed just about an 80 percent  
14 turn-down rate on the so-called reconstruction on  
15 what our dose records were. I saw the records  
16 before they were thrown through the wood chipper.  
17 They were nice enough to send me to school to learn  
18 how to read these. And the guards ourselves -- I  
19 can't speak for Herman's people. But we were  
20 receiving anywhere from 6.2 to 12 rem a year.  
21 That's a fact that I will stand on.

22 The records got put through a wood  
23 chipper. That's why we have such a high cancer rate  
24 with the guard department, and it's one reason we  
25 have such a low -- an 80 percent turn-down rate.

1 Because now with what's being done and how it's  
2 being done, we cannot meet the 50 percent causation.

3 One of my questions -- I would like to ask  
4 a question that I did not ask in Q&A. When the  
5 pilot plant, part of the pilot plant that is buried  
6 on plant site, DOE sent nickel materials there to be  
7 resmelted and the plant became contaminated. We  
8 were not informed that this was contaminated  
9 material and people got sick. Now they have people  
10 sick that cannot get their benefits. Part of that  
11 plant is built -- is buried on this facility at  
12 Piketon. Part of it is buried over in West  
13 Virginia.

14 That happened because DOE, and you're  
15 wanting us to trust you, sent material there and did  
16 not inform them that this material was radioactive  
17 when they started smelting it back down to get the  
18 nickel and stuff. So now, what's left over there on  
19 the West Virginia side, they are paying \$250,000 a  
20 year to an EPA fine because of the runoff of  
21 contamination that's coming out of there.

22 My question that I would like to get an  
23 answer to eventually is, what's going to happen? Is  
24 that pilot plant that's buried here, is that going  
25 to be razed and that gotten rid of?

1           The other thing, with what happened at  
2 Mound when they did the things down there, they are  
3 still having trouble with that. It's still not  
4 right. Some of the things -- when I talked with the  
5 people at Rocky Flats, after they took those  
6 buildings down and then buried them on-site, they  
7 are having problems. Everybody is saying, "Don't  
8 let them build it. Don't let them bury it on-site,  
9 because DOE cannot be trusted."

10           I have to agree with that. I'm not  
11 pointing at Joel or anybody individually, but I just  
12 know from the past that they have not been  
13 trustworthy. They have allowed things to happen  
14 purposely. They allowed contractors to do things  
15 that they knew were hurting people. Gene Gillespie  
16 says, "Hey, regs change and so do we." That's just  
17 basically the way it is.

18           We have people here, their kids have died  
19 from brain cancers and things. They know that a lot  
20 of this was passed on through our work, but yet we  
21 can't get it recognized. I think that what -- that  
22 putting this here is not good. That's basically the  
23 way I feel about it.

24           Some of the people, other than myself,  
25 that's not here -- they, unfortunately, couldn't be

1 here, but they are not real happy about it, either.  
2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you for your time,  
4 Mr. Lawson.

5 We have Herman Potter, followed by  
6 Mr. Geoffrey Sea.

7 MR. POTTER: My name is Herman Potter.  
8 I'm the President of United Steelworkers Local 689.

9 Actually, Joel mentioned earlier that DOE  
10 and the contractors look at this as a holistic  
11 approach in making these decisions. We're kind of  
12 looking at the holistic approach to deal with  
13 reindustrialization of the site in dealing with this  
14 waste disposition process.

15 That being the case, we would like to  
16 actually strengthen some of the language. The  
17 reason is, we want to make sure that we get strong  
18 commitment from the Department of Energy as well as  
19 our political delegations and legislatures to make  
20 sure we have the corporate funding to actually  
21 pursue and make sure that we fulfill the final  
22 mission that DOE has set forth, at least the United  
23 Steelworkers, and I'm sure that some of our brothers  
24 in the building trades are also.

25 On the waste acceptance criteria, we would

1 like stronger language to ensure that the waste  
2 acceptance criteria is followed and monitored.

3 The consolidation of the landfills, we  
4 think that's necessary. That's a good approach, and  
5 we think that's essential to forwarding towards the  
6 reindustrialization process.

7 As far as a recycling program, we have  
8 always been for a recycling program that's strong  
9 and has very clear direction. The documents  
10 basically state that they want them to be -- that it  
11 has to be cost effective. But I think they need to  
12 go further than that. I think it needs to be --  
13 that seems to me to be a pretty subjective  
14 determination, so we would like to take the recycle  
15 process a little bit further and take it beyond just  
16 if it meets somebody's interpretation of what a  
17 cost-beneficial situation is.

18 In the process of the reindustrialization,  
19 we want to ensure that there is the building and the  
20 updating of the current infrastructure at the site,  
21 and actually maintain that, because at some point in  
22 time, if we truly want it to be an industrialized  
23 site, we have to make sure that it's got stuff there  
24 so people would want to move there. So keeping as  
25 this -- in this holistic approach, keeping the

1 infrastructure in place and built up and kept up --  
2 kept up to par, it actually keeps our workers safe,  
3 plus it also is a carrot for industries to come in  
4 and actually want to build and bring new industry  
5 there.

6 Centralized treatment facilities, that's a  
7 good approach. We need to take that approach. This  
8 is our way to demonstrate that we're better than  
9 most sites. Some sites just kind of leave plumes  
10 go. We think that this is a great opportunity for  
11 us to actually, truly not only clean up the physical  
12 stuff, but also clean up the vapors and things like  
13 that, such as the trichloroethylene.

14 Also at issue is that we would like for  
15 the facility, through the holistic approach, to be a  
16 magnet for new technology. And the process, over  
17 the next few years, I'm sure technology will  
18 increase greatly in dealing with contamination and  
19 treatment and things like that. We want to make  
20 sure that this site is available to take on those  
21 challenges, and actually have the support from our  
22 political legislation and the DOE to actually  
23 conduct those types of activities on our site, as  
24 pilot projects, if nothing else.

25 Basically, we really have a responsibility

1 to conduct business -- to conduct this business in a  
2 manner that benefits the site in the future.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Thirty seconds.

4 MR. POTTER: I'm almost done.

5 Basically, we have a really great  
6 opportunity. This site has got a lot of people  
7 that's really for cleaning it up. We have got a  
8 large workforce. Thanks to DOE, the steelworkers  
9 are growing, and we intend to continue to be there  
10 and continue to do a lot of good work.

11 I would like for DOE to consider the  
12 stronger language in this commitment to do the work.  
13 Thank you.

14 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Herman.

15 Geoffrey Sea, followed by David McClay.

16 MR. SEA: My name is Jeffrey Sea. I'm  
17 here representing the Ohio Environmental Council,  
18 which is the largest environmental group in Ohio,  
19 with over 3,000 members, as well as the new  
20 incarnation of the watchdog local group over the  
21 plant site, which we are naming tonight, in  
22 launching, called Don't Dump on Piketon.

23 Don't Dump on Piketon is the heir to the  
24 petition drive in 2006/2007 that collected over  
25 5,000 signatures from the area residents opposing

1 use from this site for radioactive waste disposal or  
2 storage. And the petition drive that collected over  
3 100 signatures, mainly from fence-line neighbors, in  
4 specific opposition to an on-site waste disposal  
5 cell just in the past few years.

6 Tonight I'm going to focus on our process  
7 comments, with substantive comments to follow in  
8 writing. We -- I'm speaking for OEC and Don't Dump  
9 on Piketon. We strongly protest the process which  
10 we believe violates the CERCLA requirements for  
11 community input into these decisions that have been  
12 premade.

13 Specifically, we object to this meeting  
14 being the sole public meeting. It was, No. 1,  
15 intentionally planned -- the whole process was  
16 intentionally planned over the major holidays.

17 This meeting was held before the public  
18 has had a chance to review the documentation.

19 Insufficient notice was given of this  
20 meeting.

21 Four, the atrocious weather conditions.  
22 The news has been broadcasting tonight as the  
23 Extreme Polar Vortex. Catastrophe was going to  
24 strike the area, and you folks should have cancelled  
25 or postponed this meeting. The fact that you didn't



1 do that is just one example of how this entire  
2 process has been rigged to ramrod through this  
3 on-site waste cell.

4 And, finally, that you are illegally  
5 consolidating two decisions that were promised to be  
6 made separately, in sequence, and logically need to  
7 be made separately, in sequence, to make any sense  
8 and for the public to have meaningful input. You  
9 are combining them to one decision, which removes  
10 the ability to separately decide these important  
11 separate stages.

12 To remedy these problems, we want, No. 1,  
13 an additional 60-day comment period. There are two  
14 major important decisions here to be made. Each  
15 decision requires 60 days of consideration and  
16 comment under CERCLA. So we want 120 days, total.

17 MR. ROBERTS: You have about 30 seconds.

18 MR. SEA: Okay. We want clear separation  
19 of the building -- of the process building and waste  
20 disposition decisions. We want meetings with DOE  
21 and Fluor with excluded stakeholder groups,  
22 including fence-line neighbors, public interest  
23 groups and Native American tribes. We want more  
24 public meetings near the end of the public comment  
25 period, and we want DOE funding for community groups

1 through tag grants, to review and provide input on  
2 these -- this major decision.

3 I have a written letter from the OEC legal  
4 department, stating their strong objections to the  
5 process.

6 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. We appreciate  
7 your comments, Mr. Sea.

8 David McClay. Is David still here?

9 FROM FLOOR: He put it in writing.

10 MR. ROBERTS: He put it in writing? Thank  
11 you.

12 Cristy Renner, followed by Chris Manegold.

13 MS. RENNER: Well, I'm Cristy Renner, and  
14 I'm going to wear two hats this evening and get it  
15 in my little time frame. The one is being an SSAB  
16 Board member, and the other one is just to comment  
17 as a citizen of this community.

18 I want to say it's been an honor working  
19 with this group. The recommendation that I want to  
20 tell you about is Recommendation 09-01. It's one of  
21 the reasons why I felt honored to work with this  
22 group, with some of the things they did.

23 We had only been with the Board maybe six  
24 months, and we had a lot of ups and downs going  
25 through, but we also had a goal for this community.

1 We were tired of being left behind when these big  
2 corporations would come in onto site and then leave  
3 and take the money elsewhere. We wanted more than  
4 just a token check at the library, a token check for  
5 the fire department.

6 So we got together in a meeting. It was  
7 one of those times where we didn't let the 60-day  
8 comment period go through. Dan Minter came running  
9 in, saying, "I've got this recommendation. We need  
10 to get it in the RFP." The DOE listened to us and  
11 they actually -- it was in draft form, and they put  
12 this recommendation into the RFP, which meant a lot  
13 for our community.

14 I want to touch on the highlights. It was  
15 economic development for our community. We knew  
16 that we were going to be going in to D&D, and what  
17 that meant for the community. But we wanted  
18 employment continuity. We wanted a regional  
19 purchase program. We wanted community support in  
20 the way of funding, scholarships, business grants.  
21 You guys heard us and you did that, and you brought  
22 several million dollars into the community each year  
23 for the life of that RFP. As a group, we thank you  
24 for that. Our community thanks you. And when we  
25 come to the next RFP in the future, for what our

1 community wants to do, we want to continue and ask  
2 DOE to keep that growing inside our proposals, and  
3 that that community funding will we there for us.

4 Through this time, I've been called  
5 everything on the Board from baby killer to even  
6 being sued because we let junior business, you know,  
7 science out at Centrifuge or something. But I have  
8 respected and enjoyed and have felt honored to be a  
9 part of this group.

10 Now, as a community member -- this is my  
11 other hat. In this time, I had to leave my beloved  
12 group, and I went out to Missouri, to the Hematite  
13 project in St. Louis. I worked out there at  
14 Westinghouse at a D&D project. Hematite is half an  
15 hour from St. Louis, two hours from Paducah. We  
16 have a lot of people from Paducah that I worked with  
17 out there.

18 I was there when Paducah got the call that  
19 they were going to be shut down. We have a lot of  
20 people, you know, on the bandwagon for Paducah  
21 saying, you know, we're going to be shut down. I  
22 knew what they were going through. And they found  
23 out at the same time that the government funding was  
24 going to be cut. They were told that we won't have  
25 enough cleanup with you guys, and they got on their

1 little rallying fence and said, you know what, we  
2 are a community of 100,000 people. Portsmouth is a  
3 rural community of 5,000 people. If you can't  
4 afford to clean us up, then shut them down and turn  
5 the money over to us.

6 That scared me. I came back because I got  
7 cut with Westinghouse. Found out six months ago  
8 that that D&D site actually got closed down, lack of  
9 funding. It was partially funded by DOE and by  
10 Westinghouse.

11 But I didn't realize until I came back on  
12 the Board that there was a solution. We need to  
13 start getting on our bandwagon and start taking  
14 responsibility for this community. I believe it was  
15 called the Closure Fund, where Fernald, Mound and  
16 Rocky Flats got together and went to their  
17 representatives and Congress and senators and said,  
18 listen, if you give us so-much amount of money that  
19 we don't have to budget and beg for every year, we  
20 can get this cleanup done in ten years.

21 So I would like to offer, you know, to my  
22 Congressmen and Senators, and anybody else that  
23 would like to get together in the community and help  
24 me work with somebody, so that we can get that  
25 Closure Fund started in our community, so we can

1 group with Paducah instead of letting Paducah take  
2 away our funding. We can gather the community and  
3 work and get something set in stone for our site.  
4 Thank you.

5 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Cristy.  
6 Appreciate your time.

7 We have Chris Manegold, followed by Cole  
8 Coleman.

9 MR. MANEGOLD: I'm Chris Manegold. My day  
10 job is Chief Executive Officer for the Economic  
11 Development Alliance of Southern Ohio.

12 A lot has been said about trust and  
13 suspicions and such. In my eight and a half years  
14 now of working with this neighborhood, I've  
15 certainly been exposed to a lot of the passion and  
16 emotion around this, and it's good to see that it  
17 still exists.

18 First of all, I have known Fluor and this  
19 corporation for most of the 40 years of my career in  
20 various projects. There is an element of trust that  
21 is there in terms of their corporate reputation, but  
22 we don't have to rely on that. There is health  
23 oversight. There is environmental oversight outside  
24 of the Department of Energy, outside of Fluor's own  
25 protocols. I think we need to have confidence in

1 that, in terms of the on-site -- the on-site  
2 disposal.

3 From an economic standpoint, it makes a  
4 lot of sense. This is a community -- the Pike  
5 County Community fought the Cold War just as much as  
6 anybody that put a uniform on. And it's good to see  
7 that the United States Government is in the process  
8 of honoring that Veteran service by the cleanup of  
9 this site. And basically getting it into a  
10 condition where it can be a productive facility,  
11 going forward.

12 And to echo some of the comments that were  
13 made earlier, I think this needs to be seen as the  
14 first step in a continuing process of cleanup. I  
15 think the existing -- the existing cells, the  
16 existing plumes do need to be cleaned up. I think  
17 there has to be a firm commitment to that as part of  
18 this process, so that we do end up with, perhaps, a  
19 1,000-acre industrial site at the end of the day.

20 But I have learned from my dealings with  
21 other federal agencies, the Department of Defense,  
22 FAA and EPA enough to know that when the government  
23 is in a position to make a decision, you darn well  
24 better have a plan to make, and I think we're all in  
25 that direction.

1           So I commend you for being open in this  
2 process, despite some of the other comments that  
3 have been made. I have always been able to get  
4 questions answered, I believe, to my satisfaction.

5           Just because we're in the economic  
6 development business doesn't mean develop at any  
7 cost. There are some things that just aren't right.  
8 This is one of those circumstances where things have  
9 aligned to make it right for the Pike County  
10 community, for the southern Ohio region and the  
11 future going forward.

12           My career won't survive the cleanup and  
13 the actual point of this, but we need to get the  
14 process started. We need to tip over the dominoes  
15 and begin to see things lining up and getting done  
16 on behalf of this community and on behalf of this  
17 region so that jobs can be replaced. Those are my  
18 comments.

19           MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Manegold.

20           We have Cole Coleman, followed by Travis  
21 Journey.

22           FROM FLOOR: They went back there.

23           MR. ROBERTS: They are providing it back  
24 there? Outstanding. That's an outstanding  
25 opportunity for you, if you would like to give your



1        comments in the back. It all goes to the same  
2        place.

3                Shawn Caudill. Did he go to the back,  
4        too?

5                FROM FLOOR: He went back there.

6                MR. ROBERTS: We're going to assume he  
7        did.

8                Sharon Manson.

9                MS. MANSON: Thank you for having this  
10       meeting this evening to help clarify some of the  
11       questions that the public has had. We appreciate  
12       you doing that.

13               I'm going to comment on Recommendation  
14       13-04, written July 11th, 2013. First of all, the  
15       background for this recommendation, it has been 60  
16       years since the construction of the Portsmouth  
17       Gaseous Diffusion Plant. And a greenbelt was left,  
18       whether that was done on purpose or not, that  
19       encompasses nearly the whole reservation. And  
20       throughout those years, a rich mosaic of habitats  
21       have been developed. That was done, and we checked  
22       on all this information from Ohio University, who  
23       gave us the study and did the study resulting in a  
24       map for that.

25               Many of these habitats are critical to the

1 flora and fauna found in them. Most notably are the  
2 old trees, the 200-year-old trees that grow there in  
3 the hardwood forest.

4 So the Portsmouth SSAB believes it's  
5 important to the community, and beneficial to  
6 maintain such habitat areas as green space and  
7 potential conservation areas.

8 Our recommendation is that DOE fund a land  
9 use plan for the entire reservation. That was done  
10 for the Miamisburg Mound Complex, resulting in a  
11 variety of reuse opportunities. It's important to  
12 establish clear goals for the reuse, while providing  
13 critical habitats for the plants and animals. This  
14 would also include economic development. We request  
15 that this plan incorporate green space and potential  
16 conservation areas.

17 We also believe such a plan will benefit  
18 the community and DOE. By establishing clear goals  
19 now, costly future changes to the infrastructure may  
20 be avoided and the site may be left in a more  
21 attractive state for prospective tenants and to  
22 develop more economic development. Thanks for what  
23 you do.

24 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sharon.

25 Are there any members of the public that

1 had signed up for comments that I missed?

2 I believe that concludes the formal oral  
3 comment period tonight on the waste disposition  
4 proposal.

5 We have approximately 20 cards for folks  
6 that wish to speak on the process building D&D. Do  
7 we need to take a small break before we go?

8 FROM FLOOR: Yes.

9 MR. ROBERTS: Let's take five minutes,  
10 then we'll come back and begin.

11 (Recess taken.)

12 MR. ROBERTS: We're going to formally open  
13 the public comment session for the proposed plan for  
14 the process buildings and complex facility  
15 evaluation project. We're going to use the same  
16 format we used to the previous session.

17 Our first speaker is Tom Berry. Tom, are  
18 you here? All right. I'm not seeing Tom Berry, so  
19 we're going to slide forward.

20 Ricky Miles. Ricky, are you -- okay. You  
21 will be followed by Norm Brooks.

22 FROM FLOOR: He's gone.

23 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

24 MR. MILES: My name is Ricky Miles. I'm  
25 Special International Rep for Laborers International

1 Union of North America.

2 I'm in full support of the D&D of the  
3 three process buildings at Portsmouth. I support  
4 Alternative 2. Without it, the site cannot be  
5 reindustrialized. There would be no advantage to  
6 the community out of it.

7 Currently at the Oak Ridge facility -- of  
8 these three Cold War plants, two of them are down.  
9 They are on the ground, grass planted in the area.  
10 The third one is being taken down now. Oak Ridge  
11 has got great economic advantage out of the  
12 reindustrialization of that site. That's what needs  
13 to happen in Portsmouth. Thank you.

14 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you for your comments,  
15 Mr. Miles.

16 We're looking for Jim McGraw. Did I see  
17 Jim leave as well?

18 FROM FLOOR: He left.

19 MR. ROBERTS: CJ Blevins?

20 FROM FLOOR: He left.

21 MR. ROBERTS: Vina Colley?

22 Dan Minter. You'll be followed by Will  
23 Henderson.

24 MR. MINTER: Again, I'm Dan Minter. On  
25 this proposed plan, I've got a couple things I want

1 to outline that I think are important.

2 Just a real quick background, I guess, I'm  
3 a lifetime resident, an SSAB Board member and also  
4 Vice-Chairman of SODI.

5 The recommendation on this particular one  
6 is to maintain critical infrastructure. The process  
7 is also involving the D&D, and there was some  
8 discussion about providing facilities to be reused  
9 in the interim, that that's still a process that can  
10 happen. I think that's important to consider that  
11 as an option, and also preserving the  
12 infrastructure.

13 As you know, this facility has 27 miles of  
14 rail and road. You have 2,200 megawatts of power  
15 that can be brought in or taken out via the  
16 transmission lines. You have over 20 million  
17 gallons of make-up water. That infrastructure makes  
18 this facility very advantageous or attractive to the  
19 economic development in the future, and maintaining  
20 those are critical. So I would recommend that that  
21 be part of the process as well. That's my comment.  
22 Thank you.

23 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you for your comment,  
24 Mr. Minter.

25 While Will is approaching the mic, I just

1 wanted to remind everyone that this is a separate  
2 comment period. These comments will be transcribed  
3 and placed into a separate document from the one  
4 that was done earlier. So if, by chance, you want  
5 to reference comments that were made earlier in the  
6 evening, there won't be a reference, if that makes  
7 sense. So you probably need to leave your total  
8 thought. Just wanted to give a fair warning.

9 MR. HENDERSON: Thank you.

10 MR. ROBERTS: Will Henderson, followed by  
11 Jeff Walburn. Go ahead.

12 MR. HENDERSON: My comments are in regards  
13 to the large amount of steel that exists inside of  
14 the process buildings. I have continued to make  
15 remarks in regards to recycling and asset recovery.  
16 These remarks will be in line with that as well.

17 The asset recovery and reuse program  
18 that's currently in place needs to be expanded.  
19 There needs to be a consideration given to what the  
20 cost would be if you were to take that material and  
21 place it into the on-site disposal cell. Because  
22 every single piece of material that goes into the  
23 on-site disposal cell has a price tag with it,  
24 gentleman. That price tag needs to be offset. So  
25 if we can go ahead and take that into consideration

1 now, that makes recycling the steel I-beams, that  
2 exist currently inside of the facilities, cost  
3 effective to recycle. Whereas, on their surface, if  
4 you just looked at them as a steel I-beam, their  
5 value would be inconsequential. It would be cheaper  
6 to actually just manufacture a new one.

7 But I think it's ill-advised to look at it  
8 in that perspective, without taking into  
9 consideration the reduction and on-site disposal  
10 cell footprint. That can be achieved by reusing  
11 those I-beams.

12 Likewise, a lot of the foundations that  
13 exist on the facilities currently, that material can  
14 be ground up and reused for roadbeds, future  
15 roadbeds, and that's material that doesn't have to  
16 be brought in or purchased from some other location.  
17 It's easy enough to do, to set that aside for the  
18 future safety, provided that, obviously, there's no  
19 high-level of waste associated with that material.  
20 That's really my remarks. Thank you.

21 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Henderson.

22 We have Jeff Walburn, followed by Jody  
23 Crabtree. Jody still here?

24 FROM FLOOR: No.

25 MR. WALBURN: My name is Jeff Walburn. I

1 worked at the plant for 31 years. I have thousands  
2 of hours in the 326 process building.

3 To the uneducated eye or ear, it seems  
4 wonderful to suggest you just go in there and just  
5 cut that place apart. There's thousands of miles of  
6 pipe that have been there since 1954. If it were a  
7 '54 Cadillac, every bit of sludge and problem in  
8 that engine -- I'm going to call it an engine,  
9 because that's what it's like, in mass, is still  
10 there. So when you take this apart, it should be  
11 taken off-site.

12 Now, DOE made that site under regulation  
13 as built, and if you ask them how it ran, they will  
14 tell you it ran this way, as long as it was running  
15 right. But because of the process, there's been  
16 other daughter products added to the site that were  
17 not there, that were not expected to be in the  
18 process. That's why they have to be renewed and  
19 cleaned and taken off-site.

20 If you want to really reindustrialize the  
21 place -- just like Yucca Mountain was a DOE program,  
22 go out and educate yourself about a national  
23 program. You said it wasn't done in a vacuum, but  
24 it was done in a vacuum, because all you want to  
25 talk about is Piketon and Waverly and Scioto County



1 and Jackson County. But it is a national problem,  
2 and that track record is poor.

3 When the DOE has 4,200 cell phone and  
4 e-mails on why they fired the engineer at Hanford  
5 and ask for them, they say we're not giving them to  
6 you. And they say, okay, and just turn and wave  
7 their hands up and walk off. It wasn't going to be  
8 in litigation. Yeah, it will be under seal for a  
9 couple years. Any common worker will be starved to  
10 death.

11 Just like under the NRC, Metropolis,  
12 Illinois, three weeks ago, they had a UF-6 release.  
13 Under NRC, they tell everybody nothing left the  
14 plant. It got out in the community. The nephew of  
15 the Mayor of Metropolis was overcome in the AEP coal  
16 yard that was northwest of the plant, hit his head  
17 and was transported to the hospital. But nothing  
18 left the plant, and that's what we always hear.

19 So NRC, you switch back and forth on your  
20 regulatory, and you have done it here on this site.  
21 Every time that a new one comes in, they have no  
22 sense to what happened on the last person that was  
23 here, or no sense to what we should do to make it  
24 right to the community.

25 But I'm telling you that you don't live in

1 a bubble, nor does Hanford nor does Yucca Mountain.  
2 Did Harry Reed make that a bad project, or does he  
3 just know that it is? But he gets the blame for  
4 shutting it down, because the dumping -- they want  
5 to dump our waste in Nevada -- which they should  
6 surely make a reservation somewhere, to find a place  
7 to dump it. But you suggest that you generated it  
8 here, that it should be dumped here. What you  
9 generated here is not what is here now.

10 MR. ROBERTS: You've got about 30 seconds.

11 MR. WALBURN: It is not what the process  
12 was supposed to be. It should not be in the site.  
13 You transported the pilot plant, and I watched it be  
14 done in open coal trucks, interstate. They took the  
15 pilot plant from West Virginia --

16 Joe Manchin -- we have been talking to Joe  
17 Manchin. They know that the City of Huntington is  
18 being decimated by a \$250,000 fee each year on this  
19 pilot plant. You dumped it on our site.

20 Now you thought you could stamp that dump  
21 into oblivion at that plant. It just contaminated  
22 that plant. And the metal they made that went into  
23 racks and things that sold at Bed, Bath & Beyond,  
24 and places that went to Mexico, comes back maybe as  
25 spoons. That's a fact. It's documented.

1 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you for your comments  
2 as well.

3 Is Cristy Renner here?

4 FROM FLOOR: No.

5 MR. ROBERTS: I thought I saw her leave.  
6 Chick Lawson, followed by Geoffrey Sea.

7 MR. LAWSON: I'm going to sort of take up  
8 where Jeff left off. My name is Chick Lawson,  
9 again. Former employee representing NWA.

10 Basically, with the piping situation in  
11 the process buildings, we know that once the process  
12 is shut down, even though they gave it a clean bill  
13 of health, supposedly, that there was no deposits  
14 left in there, that they are still finding deposits,  
15 which basically what you've got was the old DOE  
16 understudy worker, which actually stands for  
17 sub-critical reaction.

18 Part of the problem with that, you have  
19 increased neutron activity, which that's what that  
20 rem wall detector is for, and they have found lots  
21 of neutrons. I know when we were working there, the  
22 neutron wasn't even configured into the doses.

23 I really worry about the younger workers  
24 now that are out there working and trying to do a  
25 good job. They are being told they don't have to

1 worry, that the dust and things that they are  
2 sweeping out, when they are cracking these  
3 converters and different things open, that if it  
4 gets in you, just like they used to say in the old  
5 days, just go home, drink a beer, it will be in and  
6 out and you'll be okay.

7 That's not really true. DOE knows that's  
8 not true. NRC knew it wasn't true when they were  
9 here. A lot of these things were taking place, and  
10 I think you're going to have a whole new generation  
11 of sick workers because of the slow-cooker  
12 phenomenon that's in that piping.

13 I know of a situation where they cut pipe  
14 in the 26 building. We're talking down there around  
15 the 90 percent assay area. And when the pipe  
16 dropped, it had a two-inch opening from the product  
17 on one end, and the other end had --  
18 the supervisors -- I could barely get my little  
19 finger in the hole.

20 Well, that wasn't supposed to be there.  
21 They got a clean read. Why did they get a clean  
22 read and have that large of a deposit? What's  
23 really scary about that, is that when that  
24 supervisor saw it and he said, "That's product.  
25 That can't go over in that waste bin." The

1 supervisor over him come in and says, "Yes. That's  
2 not product," and he tells the guy to pick it up and  
3 put it in the waste bin.

4 My question is, when it went into the  
5 waste bin, where did that go? And where do some of  
6 those other pieces of pipe go?

7 The other problem we have with that, with  
8 that high of an assay -- you are educated gentlemen,  
9 you know about this. If someone throws another one  
10 in there, a deposit of that size that's not supposed  
11 to be there, and one lands on top of the other, you  
12 know what's going to happen. You're not going to  
13 have your 24-inch configuration, and you're going to  
14 have a criticality, and then you're going to have  
15 somebody dead. That has happened before in the  
16 past. It happened down at Oak Ridge. That's all  
17 well documented when the guy died down there.

18 We have had situations in the 705, when  
19 they have cracked them open, and when the stuff fell  
20 out, we had a couple of deposits fall out, large  
21 amounts, and it looked like a fireworks display  
22 going off on the floor. I mean that literally. We  
23 would see those kind of things, because when they  
24 would escort certain things in, because of the high  
25 assay, we had to escort and put up perimeter

1 securities and different things like that to deal  
2 with it.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Thirty seconds, Mr. Lawson.

4 MR. LAWSON: Because of that, I am deeply  
5 concerned about some of the workers now that may not  
6 be getting the protections and the true education  
7 they really need to understand exactly what they are  
8 working with. Thank you.

9 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

10 Mr. Sea, sir, close us out.

11 MR. SEA: Geoffrey Sea with Ohio  
12 Environmental Council and Don't Dump on Piketon.

13 I am going to -- since this is a separate  
14 process, I am going to require that my process  
15 comments, which were lengthy and were submitted for  
16 the earlier section, which all apply equally to this  
17 one, because they are about the process of dividing  
18 these two decisions -- I'm going to require that the  
19 DOE do go and refer to those comments rather than  
20 repeat all of them.

21 But I will formally, because this is a  
22 separate process, give you another copy of the  
23 letter from the counsel of the Ohio Environmental  
24 Council, stating their strong objections to this  
25 whole process.

1           This exemplifies the problem of dividing  
2 these two decisions, and then combining them in this  
3 weird way, which we contend is actually illegal. By  
4 combining them, you're making it impossible for  
5 there to be a different decision on either stage.

6           Is it possible to conceive that DOE would  
7 decide to not tear down the process buildings, but  
8 to build an on-site waste disposal cell to handle  
9 the waste from the process buildings? No. Of  
10 course, that's not possible. But, you haven't  
11 combined them into one. You have kept them as two  
12 separate decisions. You have essentially made it --  
13 you have stacked the deck. You have made this --  
14 you have made it impossible for the decision to be  
15 anything other than you preprogrammed it to be.

16           Now, I'm going to address some particular  
17 problems with the process building decision itself.  
18 We support tearing down the process buildings. I  
19 think everybody understands that. And there could  
20 be a lot of common ground if you had actually worked  
21 with the stakeholders that you need to work with,  
22 not just the ones you selected because they agree  
23 with your position.

24           We could get together and we could make  
25 some actual rational, community-enhancing decisions

1 about, okay, we need to tear down the process  
2 buildings. But there are some facilities, one in  
3 particular, that does not need to be teared down.  
4 Everybody knows what it is. It's not contaminated.  
5 It's a very architecturally-important facility.  
6 It's the facility that was used as the control room  
7 for the general complex, and that's why it's not  
8 contaminated inside.

9 That building would serve a whole variety  
10 of great alternative uses. It's structurally very  
11 strong, unlike the process buildings. It would be a  
12 crime to tear that building down. But we think that  
13 you have rigged the process to tear that building  
14 down, for reasons that aren't fully disclosed in  
15 your program. And you have rigged your process to  
16 make sure that it's impossible for bonafide  
17 community groups to come forward with rational  
18 alternatives for what should be done on this plant  
19 site.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Thirty seconds.

21 MR. SEA: Okay. We have particular  
22 problems with the arrangement that you have made to  
23 have SODI be the key intermediary. SODI, although  
24 it claims to be a non-profit organization, is  
25 actually a for-profit organization. They were



1 members of two for-profit consortiums; one, to store  
2 spent nuclear fuel at the site, and the second to  
3 build a nuclear reactor at the site. They have  
4 never formally terminated either of those  
5 consortiums as far as we know.

6 We contend it would be illegal for you to  
7 put into your decision a concession to a for-profit  
8 organization that has pre-decided what it wants to  
9 put on the site, and given them the role of being  
10 the decider, in this whole process, of what  
11 buildings stand and what buildings go. Thank you.

12 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Sea.

13 Are there any other members of the public  
14 that we missed that wanted to speak during the  
15 comment period?

16 Jeff, it's back to you, sir, to close us  
17 out.

18 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Eric. And thank  
19 you, again, for everyone who came out tonight.

20 Just a reminder, we do have some contact  
21 information here. If you do have any additional  
22 questions beyond tonight, that's my phone number.  
23 And here is Karen Price behind me, and that's her  
24 number as well. If you have got any questions, we  
25 would be glad to follow back up and get some answers

1 for you.

2 Just a reminder, it is cold outside. Be  
3 careful getting home.

4 - - -

5 Thereupon, at 9:36 p.m., Monday,  
6 November 17, 2014, the public hearing was concluded.

7 - - -

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify on this 22nd day of  
November, 2014 that the foregoing is a true and  
correct transcript of the proceedings and testimony  
in this matter as compared with my stenographic  
notes.

My commission expires  
June 19, 2017

\_\_\_\_\_  
DIANA L. HODGE, NOTARY PUBLIC  
IN AND FOR THE STATE OF OHIO